RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

J. C. ROPER

JKM LIBRARY
LC311.R784
Roper, John Caswell,
Religious aspects of education
3 9968 02659 3718

ACCESSION NUMBER 56342 SHELF NUMBER LC 311

The Virginia Library

McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago
825 Belden Avenue

From

Received Sept, 1926

RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

By

JOHN CASWELL ROPER

SECRETARY OF EDUCATION FOR THE UPPER SOUTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY, CHICAGO

NASHVILLE, TENN.

COKESBURY PRESS

1926

Copyright, 1926
by
Lamar & Barton

Printed in the United States of America

LC 311
R 784

In Grateful Appreciation of Kindnesses, This Book Is Affectionately Dedicated to

DR. PATTERSON WARDLAW

DEAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, S. C.

AND

PROF. R. O. LAWTON

PROFESSOR OF BIBLE AND PHILOSOPHY IN LANDER COLLEGE, GREENWOOD, S. C.

Worthy Representatives of State and Church Institutions.

PREFACE

THE author of "Religious Aspects of Education" is not attempting to treat in a technical way disputed policies in present-day education. He seeks to call attention to some of the high spots in the educational life of the past, to note certain present-day tendencies, to consider certain manifest weaknesses in the practices now in use, and especially to note a failure to secure the results in building moral character which society has a right to demand. The necessity for the presence of religion in the process of education is regarded as essential in securing the development of character able to stand the moral strains of life.

The position is not taken that there are no other forces at fault in the world to-day. The American home is failing to function as it should. The pulpit must take its share of the blame. Nevertheless, the home is to a remarkable degree the product of the school of yesterday, and the pulpit is expressing the indoctrination which it received not many years ago.

Growing out of present-day tendencies, moral and religious education commands the attention of the public at large as never before. An orthodox faith is an absolute essential if civilization is to survive. Morality and religion cannot be divorced.

A sympathetic reader can hardly fail to catch the spirit that animates the writer and to divine his purpose.

J. C. ROPER.

CHESTER, S. C., June 25, 1925.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Contribution of the Church to the Rise of Education in America	1
II	The Secularization of the Schools in America	23
III	The Merits of Secularized Education Examined	44
IV	Education Redefined	83
V	A Revised Curriculum Suggested . . .	99
VI	The Teacher and His Qualifications .	121
VII	Moral and Religious Education . . .	143
VIII	Moral and Religious Education (Continued)	165
IX	The Supernatural in Education . . .	188

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHICAGO

CHAPTER I

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE CHURCH TO THE RISE OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA

UNFORTUNATELY the subject announced is not quite so simple as a casual consideration would lead one to believe. For, while it is comparatively easy to note the immediate contributions of the Church to early education in America, it must not be forgotten that these early contributions reach far back into human history, and have their origin in times prior to the invention of our present alphabet.

Egypt is not only the home of buried cities, but amidst the relics of its departed glory can be found mute symbols of the life history of a people that enjoyed a rare culture. Even here it may be found that the Church, after the fashion of that age, was the pioneer and promoter in the types of culture of that time. It has been said that "In Egypt, more than anywhere else, education and religion walked hand in hand. Philosophy held sway, and the learned class ruled the state and possessed much of its wealth. The severely practical education given by the priests excluded even gymnastics and music."[1]

In Persia "it seems clear that modern school subjects were absolutely subordinate to training in arms and in positive virtue, and if a boy could shoot accurately, ride well, *and told the truth*, (italics mine) his education was held to be complete." Hence in

[1] Funk & Wagnalls, "Standard Encyclopedia," Vol. 9, p. 371.

Persia we see at least the moral contribution being made to the realm of education.[2]

In India we find the genesis for the Monitorial System, adopted in England by Dr. Andrew Bell in 1797, and which was brought to this country by Joseph Lancaster in 1806. For it was in that country that senior pupils were first employed to teach the juniors. Moreover, the open-air system of teaching was in use in that remote period.[3]

Among the Jews education was very highly esteemed. While most of their work was done in the home, yet reading and writing were much more widely diffused among them than among the Gentile races of that period. Besides living upon a higher plane intellectually, the Jews received moral training of a distinctive character.[4] Moreover, the Rabbis were accustomed to conduct schools in connection with the synagogues.[5] This of course was supplementary to the work which was done so universally in the home, and doubtless much of it had reference to the religious knowledge which the people should know. No doubt this effort to teach in a definite way had its effect upon all subsequent nationalities, and it is no strain upon the imagination to discover the genesis of the widespread and common demand for religious education to-day in the far-off schools of the priests.

It is interesting to note that one of the oldest forms of writing was by priests in Egypt. Much of this was for the worship of the gods and the characters used were called *hieroglyphs* "priests writing"). Not only so, but it is known that many of the officials in ancient Egypt were called from the priesthood by their

[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*, 371, 372; and Kemp, "History of Education," p. 280.
[4] Funk & Wagnalls, "Standard Encyclopedia," Vol. 9, p. 372.
[5] Kemp, "History of Education," p. 51; and Graves, p. 123.

kings. That is to say, not only was the early educational and religious life of Egypt affected by the Church of that time, but political life as well.[6]

It is a well-known fact that among the children of God, as designated by the Jewish people, for a long period of time the Church and State were synonymous. Indeed, while it is true that Saul was anointed king by a prophet of God, it is nevertheless true that this was contrary to the will, or at least to the desire, of God himself. More than once God has granted the desire of a people and has at the same time sent leanness upon their souls. He well knew that the desire of Israel for a king was to be like the heathen nations round about her. Saul was granted as a king, but the religious life of the people suffered. In proportion, then, as this chosen people were under the special domination of the Almighty through his visible Church, in that proportion alone, did they realize his good pleasure.

We have glimpsed these far-off times for the purpose of refreshing our minds upon the fact of the dominancy and the efficacy of religious forms looking toward a later civilization that was to mark improvements upon the old. For while nations may have risen and perished long before Columbus sailed the trackless waters that led to the discovery of a New World, nevertheless there is a continuity in human history which links into an indissoluble bond the remote influences of the past with the throbbing facts of the present.

Between the land of ancient kings and the present day of modern republics lie Grecian civilization and the Empire of the Cæsars. Therefore we look to these sources as the medium of modification of earlier stages in the development and culture of the human mind. Also, we may take a look at the objectives that seemed

[6] West, "Ancient World" (Revised), p. 58.

to animate these peoples in their relation to the matter of education.

It is generally conceded that modern civilization is predicated largely upon the Grecian and the Roman civilizations, upon which were grafted the benign influences of Christianity. For while Christianity was not evolved out of the evolutionary processes of human development, either in mind or in morals, it nevertheless had to deal with such material as it found in the world when it came as a fresh, new deposit right from the heart of God to transform and make anew the civilization of that and all subsequent ages.

Inasmuch, then, as we must reckon with the contribution of the Grecian civilization, it is well to remember that it was itself influenced by the culture of Egypt, Assyria, and that of the Hebrew people. In other words, while we think of Greece as being the starting point of modern movements, we should remember that this country was itself the beneficiary of all previous ages. We look to Greece as the source for the rise of the thought of *liberty*. Her political instinct was contrary to the despotism of Assyria. Likewise, she resented the priestcraft of Egypt. Doubtless the very presence of these situations in these foreign countries helped to make more lively in the Grecian mind this sense of liberty.

Now it is true that the Greeks borrowed from every conceivable source. It has been said that the Phœnicians taught the Greeks writing, but it is admitted that the Greeks wrote. From whatever source came the raw product, it was converted into a part of the national life of a great people. It is conceded that we owe to Greece our love of science, art, and freedom. It is also admitted that from Greece the Western world received the spirit of progress. In this way education received a mighty impulse, and not only so, but there was more

or less of bias and direction mixed with the impulse which was given to it. "Greece first took up the task of equipping man with all that fits him for civil life and promotes his secular well-being; of unfolding and expanding every inborn faculty and energy, bodily and mental; of striving restlessly after the perfection of the whole, and finding in this effort after an unattainable ideal that by which man becomes like to the gods."

However, education in ancient Greece regarded the claims of the state as being supreme, and its sole purpose was to prepare the pupil for becoming a good citizen, though it must be noted that both Plato and Aristotle saw more in education than was involved in the duties of citizenship. Both of these philosophers fought against the rhetorical education of the Sophists, who made ambition the aim of worldly achievement.

When we speak of Greece we think first of Athens. When Athens was in her glory it was the Golden Age of Greece. It was in this period that we find certain nonschool educational forces operating in the city. A beautiful description has been given of the Athenian who lived in the atmosphere and culture during the time of Pericles. It was what the student looked upon, what he heard, what caught his sympathy, and what he read that designated the education of that time. Not by the discipline such as was employed by Sparta and Rome, but by the charm of her influence, Athens trained her youth.[7]

In description of a student of this period it is written:

> He took his way past the temples where the friezes of Phidias seemed to breathe and struggle, under the shadow of the colonnades reared by the craft of Ictinus or Callicrates and glowing with the hues of Polygnotus, to the agora where, like his Aryan forefathers by the shores of the Caspian, or his Teutonic

[7] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 13.

> cousins in the forests of Germany, he was to take his part as a free man in fixing the fortunes of his country. There he would listen, with the eagerness of one who knew that all he held most dear was trembling in the balance, to the pregnant eloquence of Pericles. Or, in later time, he would measure the sober prudence of Nicias against the boisterous turbulence of Cleon, or the daring brilliance of Alcibiades. Then, as the great Dionysia came round once more with the springtime, and the sea was open again for traffic, and from every quarter of Hellas the strangers flocked for pleasure or business, he would take his place betimes in the theater of Dionysius, and gaze from sunrise to sunset on the successive tragedies in which Sophocles, and Euripides, and Ion of Chios, were contending for the prize of poetry. Or, at the lesser festivals, he would listen to the wonderful comedies of Eupolis, Aristophanes, or the old Cratinus, with their rollicking fun and snatches of sweetest melody, their savage attacks on personal enemies and merry jeers at well-known cowards or wantons, and underlying all, their weighty allusions and earnest political purpose.[8]

Not only was the student to imbibe from the atmosphere in which he lived suggestions of "weighty allusions and earnest political purpose," but he was taught by his schoolmasters from "the books which openly or by allegory teach him who was a great hero, who was a lover of justice and purity."[9] "For the training of character was before all things the object of Hellenic education; it was this which Hellenic parents particularly demanded of the schoolmasters. So strongly did they believe that virtue could be taught that they held the teacher responsible for any subsequent misdemeanor of his pupils."[10]

The main object of the schools was to train the character of the young. Hence the schoolmasters who were to come into such close contact with the boys were chosen with very great care. Much attention was given

[8] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 12.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 6. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

to their reputation for virtue and conduct. This was particularly observed in Sparta.[11]

In Sparta we learn that "their whole education was an exercise of obedience."[12] The rulers of the school were selected with very great discretion, and the one actually in charge of the boys divided them into companies, placing over them the most discreet among their number. Here again we see something of the later Monitorial System adopted by Dr. Bell in England, and introduced into America by Lancaster.

The second contribution to modern life grows out of Roman civilization. In the early days of the Roman Republic education was greatly influenced by the home. The father was responsible to the State for the training of his son in morality, religion, and in the duties of citizenship. Between the ages of seven and twelve the boy was expected to go to school and to master the three R's. Here again we see foreshadowed the three R's which played so important a part in the early educational processes of our own country. After thirteen, the boy studied literature, history, philosophy, poetry, and Greek. This completed his education.[13]

A better conception of the significance of Roman education may be gathered from the personal experience of Marcus Aurelius, who was Emperor of Rome from 161 to 180 A.D., which is in part as follows:

> 1. From my grandfather Verus (I learned) good morals and the government of my temper.
> 2. From the reputation and remembrance of my father, modesty and a manly character.
> 3. From my mother, piety and beneficence, and abstinence, not only from evil deeds, but even from evil thoughts; and further simplicity in my way of living, far removed from the habits of the rich.
> 4. From my great-grandfather, not to have fre-

[11] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 9.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[13] Funk & Wagnalls, "Encyclopedia," Vol. 9, p. 372.

quented public schools, and to have had good teachers at home, and to know that on such things a man should spend liberally.

5. From my governor . . . I learned endurance of labor, and to want little, and to work with my own hands, and not to meddle with other people's affairs, and not to be ready to listen to slander. . . .

8. From Apollonius I learned freedom of will and undeviating steadiness of purpose; and to look to nothing else, not even for a moment, except to reason. . . .

9. From Sextus, a benevolent disposition, and the example of a family governed in a fatherly manner, and the idea of living conformably to nature. . . .

10. From Alexander the grammarian, to refrain from fault-finding, and not in a reproachful way to chide those who uttered any barbarous or solecistic or strange-sounding expression; but dexterously to introduce the very expression which ought to have been used, and in the way of answer or giving confirmation, or joining in an inquiry about the thing itself, not about the word, or by some other fit suggestion. . . .

14. From my brother Severus, to love my kin, and to love truth, and to love justice. . . .

15. From Maximus I learned self-government, and not to be led aside by anything; and cheerfulness in all circumstances, as well as in illness; and a just admixture in the moral character of sweetness and dignity, and to do what was set before me without complaining. . . .

16. In my father I observed mildness of temper, and unchangeable resolution in the things which he had determined after due deliberation; and no vainglory in those things which men call honors; and a love of labor and perseverance; and a readiness to listen to those who had anything to propose for the common weal; and undeviating firmness in giving to every man according to his deserts; and a knowledge derived from experience of the occasions for vigorous action and for remission.[14]

The question naturally arises as to whether or not the Roman education referred to by Marcus Aurelius, together with the careful consideration given him by his

[14] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," pp. 28-30.

father and grandfather and mother, may not itself have been largely influenced by the new and vitalizing force of Christianity. For in all probability the leaven of Christianity had been working for a century or more prior to his school days. This question is raised with all the more readiness because Tacitus, writing in the year A.D. 75, contrasts the old form of education with the new form which he then observed. Presumably this was the period between the departure of the old methods and the adoption of the new before the leaven of Christianity had permeated the whole of society. With reference to the old system he says:

> In the first place, the son of every family was the legitimate offspring of a virtuous mother. The infant, as soon as born, was not consigned to the mean dwelling of a hireling nurse, but was reared and cherished in the bosom of its mother, whose highest praise it was to take care of her household affairs and attend to her children. It was customary likewise for each family to choose some elderly relation of approved conduct, to whose charge the children were committed. In her presence not one indecent word was uttered; nothing was done against propriety and good manners. The hours of study and serious employment were settled by her direction; and not only so, but even the diversions of the children were conducted with modest reserve and sanctity of manners. Thus it was that Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, superintended the education of her illustrious issue. It was thus that Aurelius trained up Julius Cæsar; and thus Atia formed the mind of Augustus. The consequence of this regular discipline was, that the young mind, whole and sound, and unwarped by irregular passions, received the elements of the liberal arts with hearty avidity.[15]

Regretting the new tendencies, he says:

> In the present age what is our practice? The infant is committed to a Greek chambermaid, and a slave or two, chosen for the purpose, generally the

[15] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," pp. 30, 31.

> worst of the whole household train, and unfit for any office of trust. From the idle tales and gross absurdities of these people, the tender and uninstructed mind is suffered to receive its earliest impressions. Throughout the house not one servant cares what he says or does in the presence of his young master; and, indeed, how should it be otherwise? Since the parents themselves are so far from training their young families to virtue and modesty, that they set them the first examples of luxury and licentiousness. Thus our youth gradually acquire a confirmed habit of impudence, and a total disregard of that reverence they owe both to themselves and to others. To say truth, it seems as if a fondness for horses, actors, and gladiators, the peculiar and distinguishing folly of this our city, was impressed upon them even in the womb: and when once a passion of this contemptible sort has seized and engaged the mind, what opening is there left for the noble arts? Who talks of anything else in our houses? If we enter the schools, what other subjects of conversation do we hear among the boys? The preceptors themselves choose no other topic more frequently to entertain their hearers; for it is not by establishing a strict discipline, or by giving proofs of their genius, that this order of men gain pupils, but by fawning and flattery.[16]

Evidently, the educational life in the time of Tacitus was in a transitional period, and while there had originated a great laxity, it is comforting to the cause of education to see the high moral standards entertained by so great a thinker and writer. For whether these men were always under the direct domination of the Church or not, they were too much alive to the world movements of their time not to reflect in some measure the highest ethical ideas entertained among men.

At any rate, from the birth of Christianity, and even beyond, there were those who believed and taught the superiority of morality and ethical ideas concerning virtue and right more than worldly aggrandizement and mere learning without a moral bias. More than

[16] "Readings in the History of Education," p. 31.

four centuries before the Christian era Socrates, in speaking to Euthydemus, who had been collecting the writings of the wise, said:

> By Juno, I feel admiration for you, because you have not preferred acquiring treasures of silver and gold rather than of wisdom; for it is plain that you consider that silver and gold are unable to make men better, but that the thought of wise men enrich their possessors with virtue.[17]

Hence we see that not only through the nations and civilizations that succeeded the Grecian and the Roman, the urge of the best in point of morality and faith had constantly been seeking to lift upward the standards of civilization. Yet, we must recognize that until Christianity had come into the world the ideal motives had not been supplied that would give to faith a moral vigor and direction enabling enough to lift civilization to the permanent standard demanded by the God of the universe. That heathen religions were better than none at all is not to be debated, but that they were adequate is to be denied.

We look then to Christianity not only for the world's culture and civilization, but to find within it those inherent forces which alone can save society and make permanent any sort of a civilization. Without the reinforcement of religious experience, life sooner or later becomes the helpless victim of mad passions and unregenerate ambitions. Therefore, it is not strange that we see the contribution which Christianity made, utilizing as it did the achievements wrought by the Grecian and the Roman civilizations, together with the peoples which had contributed to their greatness.

When Christianity came there was much private teaching of this faith. As religion spread, there was organized a system of religious schools. These were

[17] "Readings in the History of Education," p. 15.

sometimes attached to the monasteries, then to the cathedrals, and finally extended into a parish system of school-teaching. Running parallel with the schools conducted by the churches, the education of chivalry was being given in the halls and castles of the great; and while we are not disposed to grant any large religious deposit as the result of the latter form of instruction, yet it is well to note that in certain of the vows taken by the pages, the squires, and those who were coming to knighthood, there was a recognition of the Deity, and there was the cultivation of obedience and the development of certain virtues that led to a truer manhood, if not to a distinct Christian life.[18]

More than once, however, civilization would have been lost in oblivion but for the intervention of Christianity and the schools which had been established by the Church. As has already been noted, the three distinct foundations upon which the modern structure of civilization now rests were the Grecian and Roman civilizations, and then Christianity, which was superimposed. It was this last element that saved the world from mental desolation, if not moral ruin, and prevented the last ray of civilization from being destroyed by the hordes of barbarians which swept down from the north upon the civilized world of the south.

It was Benedict of Nursia who established the Benedictine Order in A.D. 528, and saved what could be saved for civilization out of the deluge of nations.[19] When the whole of Europe was desolated by war, it was from the cloisters of Ireland that schoolmasters were furnished to Europe to light once more the torches of learning. In the darkest hours of the Dark Ages,

[18] Kemp, "History of Education," p. 134.

[19] Date in question. See Briggs, "History of the Study of Theology," Vol. I, p. 197; also Collier's "New Encyclopedia," p. 483 also Kemp, "History of Education," p. 112.

it was the College of Cordova, established by converted Arabs in Spain in 910, that gave civilization a chance to come back again. [20] Upon this point there may arise debate as to whether they were strictly Mohammedans or Christians. Certain it is, in either case they were Churchmen. That is to say, the inspiration of their educational activity grew out of their relation to their religion. At any rate they caused to be put upon their public seal these words, "The servant of the Merciful rests contented in the decrees of God." And they were not oblivious to the demands made upon them by conscience, evidenced in the feeling that retribution might overtake them because they had secured prosperity by way of victory. In the Mosaics of their palace walls were to be found recurring warnings, such as, "There is no conqueror but God." [21]

When Charles the Great would extend education throughout Europe, to whom did he turn? To whom could he turn? To the staffs of cathedral schools. It was the Church of the Living God that became the nursery for education and civilization on the continent of Europe. Moreover, what individual was most responsible for bringing on the revival of learning and promoting a new day in culture and in the extension of learning among men? Was it not Martin Luther, the Priest of God, the Great Reformer, that brought on the Reformation? And was not the very basis of his contention, that every man should have the right to interpret the Word of God according to his own mind, the very occasion for the necessity of every person being able to read the Word for himself? Upon this fact is found the logical necessity for universal education. Hence it was Martin Luther who, in 1524, went to the German cities and preached the doctrine of public and

[20] Philobiblius, "History of Education," p. 111.
[21] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 131.

free education.[22] Here we see the foundation not only for the public-school system of Europe, but of America and all the world.

We may regard the contribution of Luther as being the most marked event in the advancement of modern civilization, not only for the revolution in life morals, manners, and learning, but also because the Lutheran system of education came to cover practically the whole of Northern Europe, and in a modified form, under the influence of the Anglican Church, embraced Great Britain, yet this was not the only modern movement born in the Church for the advancement of civilization. It remained for John Knox, the flaming evangelist who exclaimed "Give me Scotland, or I die!" to establish the Parish School System of Scotland. Then John Wesley, of whom Greene, in his "History of the English People," was pleased to say that the greatest movement of the century as affecting social, political, and religious England was the movement begun under the Wesleys. This movement was destined to have quite an effect upon America, in that to-day its followers represent the largest Protestant body in the New World. From the first this movement espoused the cause of education, having in mind primarily its religious aspect. For this reason John Wesley saw the corner stone of Kingswood College laid before the first Methodist chapel was ever erected.

Now, these modern movements in Europe, having their roots reaching through the centuries to the Roman and the Grecian civilization, and then beyond to Palestine, Egypt, Assyria, and enriched by that movement of history from which all subsequent time has taken its new reckoning, were to be transferred to the bleak hillsides of New England, to the plains of the developing West, and to the colonial homes of the South. Modi-

[22] Philobiblius, "History of Education," p. 188.

fied somewhat from the first by crude conditions imposed in a new land, they were to be modified more rapidly with the extraordinary progress which soon came to bless the new country.

Then, too, there were certain modern movements in Europe in the field of education which were destined to have their effect upon the Lutheran schools and the parochial schools of England, and also to insinuate their influence into the unfolding school system of America.

Among these were the humanists, of whom Roger Ascham, the tutor of Lady Jane Grey and Queen Elizabeth, was an example. They relied largely upon the study of good authors and upon their record of human experience. The Jesuits were the first to shape their methods relative to the individual nature of their pupils. The realists took the position that book work was secondary to being brought into direct contact with nature and reality. Then came Rousseau with a book of fiction, in which he causes the principal character, "Emile," to be brought up under a system in perfect and absolute accord with nature. It must forever be the marvel of all subsequent ages that so notorious a person as Rousseau, so degenerate in life and character, and depraved in morals, could ever have exercised so far-reaching an influence upon the minds of respectable men in the field of education; and yet, in a way, he was the forerunner of Pestalozzi, who really made a worthy contribution to education—however, it should be added, not until he had disproved the fallacy of Rousseau's absurd theory, by experimenting on his own child.

Pestalozzi deserves great consideration because of his intense earnestness. His absolute sacrifice of all of his private fortune in behalf of the cause of education will remain the surest evidence of his sincerity. Moreover,

he emphasized things worthy of consideration. He had little regard for the superficialities of life. His disregard for the trivialities is evidenced by the remark of an observer, who said of him: "It is quite unfortunate for the progress of his system on the Continent that he pays so little attention to exteriors, regarding dress, furniture, etc., as of no moment whatever, provided the mind and heart be right."

It comes with better grace to study a system of education from a man of this type than from one like Rousseau, who treated his own children as foundlings, and whose whole life was covered with immorality and infamy, whether serving as a footman to a great lady while acting as her private consort, or whether being dined and wined by the affluent and cultured in the banquet halls of Paris.

Since the system of Pestalozzi played such an important part in shaping education in Europe and in America, it is well to note his attitude toward the religious side of life. His teaching on this point has been summarized as follows:

> Pestalozzi opposes strenuously the opinion that religious instruction should be addressed exclusively to the understanding; and shows that religion lies deep in the hearts of men, and that it should not be enstamped from without, but developed from within; that the basis of religious feeling is to be found in the childish disposition to love, to thankfulness, to veneration, obedience, and confidence toward its parents; that these should be cultivated and strengthened and directed toward God; and that religion should be formally treated of at a later period in connection with the feelings thus excited. As he requires the mother to direct the first development of all the faculties of her child, he assigns to her especially the task of first cultivating the religious feelings.[23]

[23] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 448.

Since also the Prussian system of education has had its effect upon our system in America, and since this system was adopted after a study of the methods employed by Pestalozzi, it might be well to give brief consideration to some of the requirements made by Frederick the Great in the system established by him. We note some of the most important items:

1. Age of admission to school, 5 years.
2. All apprentices to be taught.
3. Students required to secure certificates on leaving school.
4. Attendance required.
5. School hours were definitely fixed.
6. Sunday instruction also given.
7. Tuition fees required of all who were able to pay.
8. In the case of poor children fees were provided.
9. A census of all schools was required.
10. The *moral conduct* of the students carefully examined.
11. An annual sermon on Christian education was required.
12. Church attendance required of all students.
13. The resident clergyman was in charge of the schools. "In all other affairs of the school the teacher must avail himself of the advice and suggestions of the clergyman, as his superior officer, and by his school-regulation the teachers are so directed."
14. Clergymen obligated to catechise the children: "Especially is it our pleasure, that clergymen in villages and towns shall visit the schools of their place, generally twice a week, sometimes in the morning and sometimes in the afternoon, and shall not only take the information of the sacristan or schoolmaster, but themselves examine the children in the catechism and question them after other school books. They shall hold a monthly conference with the school-teachers *in matre*, and designate to them the portion of Catechism and hymn, the psalm and Bible verses which the children shall learn during the next month."
15. The clergymen are further required to teach

them "how to observe the principal divisions of his sermon; if he is negligent and is convicted, he is suspended."[24]

Victor Cousin's report on the Prussian system to France makes a few comments worthy of our attention. Possibly to some extent, indeed, these ideas had an influence among the French people. Note the following extracts:

1. Classical studies keep alive the sacred tradition of the moral and intellectual life of the human race.
2. The German burgher schools, which are a little inferior to our Communal Colleges in classical and scientific studies, are incomparably superior to them in religious instruction.
3. After the administrative authorities, it is unquestionably the clergy who ought to occupy the most important place in the business of popular education. How is it possible they could neglect, nay, even repugn, such a mission? But that they have done so is a fact, which, however deplorable, we are bound to acknowledge.[25]

There were others in France who believed in the religious aspect of education. We quote Victor Guizot, who wrote on the importance of primary education in 1833:

> Finally, by moral and religious instruction, it provides for another class of wants quite as real as the others, and which Providence has placed in the hearts of the poorest, as well as of the richest, in this world, for upholding the dignity of human life and the protection of social order.[26]

So we see that our forefathers who migrated to this country brought with them not only their wives and children, but also their books and Bibles and school systems as well. America did not have the task of im-

[24] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," pp. 459-465.
[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 494-496.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 498.

provising a new form of education; it simply transferred the established systems as brought over by the different contingents of immigrants that came to build for themselves homes amidst the wilds of the new land.

Many of them came to this country in order to enjoy religious freedom. No sooner had they erected a place of worship than they immediately proceeded to establish a school therein or close beside it. Under the New England Town System the Church was not only the center of the town, but the school and the Church were often in the same building, and the clergyman was in charge of both. Later on, as the towns grew larger, and the district school became the direct result in order that schools might be established in the remote sections too far from town for the students to attend, it was still necessary for the clergyman to certificate the teacher—at least the grammar-school masters.[27]

Moreover, higher education was promoted in order to develop ministers and teachers to take care of the moral and the religious life of the colonists, for these people were more interested in religion than in anything else. So practically every college was initiated by the Church. Of the first 119 colleges built in America east of the Mississippi River, 104 were established by the Church and for religious purposes.[28] Even some of these institutions, which have since become independent and perhaps have drifted away from the Church, were established in the beginning through the agency of the Church. Take Harvard University as an example. Its very name commemorates the life, labors, and sacrifice of a minister. John Harvard lived but one year in America, but he gave his library and half his estate to the founding of the institution that now bears his

[27] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 45.
[28] Elmer T. Clark, "Talking Points on Christian Education," p. 98.

name. Over the gateway of this renowned institution of learning can still be read the words, "That a learned ministry may not perish from the earth."

The reason given why the framers of the Constitution had nothing to say with reference to education is that they knew that religion was more vital to the people than education; and they also knew that there could never be an agreement amongst the denominations with reference to education; hence they left the matter to the Churches. So for a long time much of the work of education in America was carried on almost exclusively under the guidance and encouragement of the Churches.

Now for a long time the matter of ownership was left without debate. In laying off the new town sites of the West, the sixteenth section was set apart for school purposes. Doubtless in many of the older communities little attention was given to the matter of title to property, because the interests of the community and the school had been carried along together, being fathered and promoted by the Churches. That issue was to come at a much later date, in the famous Dartmouth College case, when the State Legislature assumed the power of taking over an institution which had been promoted primarily by the Church. Daniel Webster not only won personal fame for himself, but made it possible for all subsequent periods in America that the Churches might hold inviolate institutions promoted by them for carrying on their educational programs.

That this matter of title was an overlooked right may be gathered by an incident recorded by Henry Alexander White. He says:

> On May 1, 1776, the presbytery met again at Timber Ridge Church. Two days later (May 3) it went in a body to Mt. Pleasant, and again held its session in the academy building and proceeded to examine Graham's school. Again the presbytery

> listened to recitations in Greek and Latin, heard some orations delivered, and gave formal approval to teacher and students. There is, probably, no other case like this on record, wherein a presbytery emphasized its absolute ownership of the school by formally organizing itself in the schoolroom and for a time assuming complete control of the work and exercises of the students.[29]

That we may better understand how far-reaching was the influence of the Church in the early days of America, reference may be made to the content of the courses of study that were put on both in the elementary schools and in the higher institutions of learning. In the elementary schools we have the Hornbook, the Primer, the Psalter, the Testament, the Bible. The Hornbook was a thin board upon which a printed leaf was pasted, then covered over with a transparent sheet of horn to protect it from being torn and from being soiled. On the sheet were printed the letters of the alphabet; then there was written, "In the name of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen," and the Lord's Prayer. So that the children, in the very next breath after learning their A B C's, were initiated into the act of worship. The Psalter, the Testament, and the Bible were used for advanced reading books in the Colonies until about 1750. The New England Primer was used in the Boston Dame Schools as late as 1876. The people recited the catechism in the churches yearly.

The Latin School was carried on because of the interest in classical studies, due to the fact that Greek was the language of the New Testament and Latin was the language in which the great theological discussions had been written. As all higher education had in mind prospective applicants for the ministry, these schools were in preparation for embryonic preachers.

[29] "Southern Presbyterian Leaders," p. 129.

Even Congress recognized that religion and education should always be interlocked in their relations. In providing for the government of the country lying north of the Ohio, in 1787 Congress provided that, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."

That there were to arise in this country motives for education other than those inspired by religion, history now records; but nevertheless in the formative period, when education was receiving its first impulse, when the nation was in the building, and when the principles were being formed that have since made us the most commanding power among all the nations of the earth, it was in education as fostered by the Church that those ideals and principles were born and nurtured. That statesmen and publicists should come to see the need for a wide diffusion of knowledge in a democracy is not surprising. That these motives need not be inconsistent with the ones that have made us great, provided they should never become divorced, is tenable. The merits of these motives, together with the consequences in the advancement of education through the public and tax-supported schools, together with the problems that confront us incident to these, demand treatment under a separate chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE SECULARIZATION OF THE SCHOOLS IN AMERICA

HAVING given attention to "The Contribution of the Church to the Rise of Education in America" in a separate chapter, the writer thinks it well to further enforce the facts contained therein by refreshing the reader's mind with excerpts from former times, as well as from the early history of America, before venturing upon the successive steps leading to the secularization of schools in America.

Going back to the Talmud, which is a collection of writings of the Rabbis or scribes, written between 70 B.C. and 500 A.D., which writings are largely interpretations of "the Law and the Prophets" for the edification of the people, we read:

> 1. He who studies and teaches others possesses treasures and riches.
> 2. He who has learned and does not impart his knowledge unto others disregards the Word of God.
> 3. It is not permitted to live in a place where there is neither master nor school.
> 4. Jerusalem was detroyed because her instructors were not respected.
> 5. If both the father and the teacher are threatened with any material loss, the latter should be protected first.
> 6. As soon as the child begins to speak, the father should teach him to say in Hebrew, "The law which Moses commanded us is the heritage of the congregation of Jacob," and "Hear, O Israel, the Eternal our God is one God."[1]

[1] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 41.

This indicates the point to which all instruction teneded, just before and after the birth of Christ.

In America, and as early as 1642, we are able to get a conception of the religious requirements in education by quoting from the "Rules and Precepts" governing Harvard College.

> 2. Let every student be plainly instructed, and earnestly pressed to consider well, the main end of his life and studies is, *to know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life,* Joh. 17:3. and therefore to lay *Christ* in the bottome, as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and Learning.
>
> And seeing the Lord only giveth wisdome, Let every one seriously set himselfe by prayer in secret to seeke it of him, Prov. 2:3.
>
> 3. Every one shall so exercise himselfe in reading the Scriptures twice a day, that he shall be ready to give such an account of his proficiency therein, both in *Theoretticall* observations of the Language, and *Logick,* and in *Practicall* and spiritual truths, as his Tutor shall require according to his ability; seeing *the entrance of the word giveth light, it giveth understanding to the simple,* Psalm 119:130.
>
> 4. That they eschewing all profanation of God's Name, Attributes, Word, Ordinances, and times of Worship, doe studie with good conscience, carefully to retaine God, and the love of his truth in their mindes else let them know, that (notwithstanding their Learning) God may give them up *to strong delusions,* and in the end *to a reprobate minde,* 2 Thes. 2: 11, 12. Rom. 1: 28.
>
> 5. That they studiously redeeme the time; observe the generall houres appointed for all the Students, and the special houres appointed for their owne *Classis:* and then dilligently attend the Lectures without any disturbance by word or gesture. And if in any thing they doubt, they shall enquire as of their fellowes, so (in case of *Non satisfaction*) modestly of their Tutors.
>
> 6. None shall, under any pretence whatsoever, frequent the company and society of such men as lead an unfit and dissolute life.
>
> Nor shall any without his Tutor's leave, or (in his absence) the call of Parents or Guardians, go abroad to other Townes.

> 7. Every Schollar shall be present in his Tutor's chamber at the 7th houre in the morning, immediately after the sound of the Bell, at his opening the Scriptures and prayer, so also at the 5th houre at night, and then give account of his owne private reading, as aforesaid in Particular the third, and constantly attend Lectures in the Hall at the houres appointed? But if any (without necessary impediment) shall absent himself from prayer or Lectures, he shall bee lyable to Admonition, if he offend above once a weeke.
>
> 8. If any Schollar shall be found to transgresse any of the Lawes of God, or the Schoole, after twice Admonition, he shall be lyable, if not *adultus,* to correction, if *adultus,* his name shall be given up to the Overseers of the Colledge, that he may bee admonished at the publick monethly Act.[2]

Also, the moral drift of the times is indicated in an extract from the resolutions offered in the founding of the Free Schools of Roxburie, Mass., in 1645:

> Whereas, the Inhabitantes of Roxburie, in consideration of their religious care of posteritie, have taken into consideration how necessarie the education of theire children in Literature will be to fitt them for public service, both in Churche and Commonwealthe, in succeeding ages. They therefore unanimously have consented and agreed to erect a free school in the said Towne of Roxburie, and to allow Twenty pounds per annum to the Schoolemaster, to bee raised out of the Messuages and part of the Lands of the severall donors (Inhabitantes of the said Towne), in severall proportions as hereafter followeth under their handes.[3]

While this excerpt is given primarily to show that the citizens were carrying on the work of preparation to fit their children, not only as citizens of the State, but also for the service of the Church, it is well to note that as they are providing for a free school by a process of taxation, an entering wedge is being placed that is vitally related to the larger separation of the schools

[2] Cubberly, "Readings in Education," pp. 292-293.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 295.

from the domination of the Church at a later time.

A further index of the purpose of the people to keep the Church in the center of education is found in a Massachusetts law enacted in 1647 and known as "the old deluder, Satan, Act":

> It being one chiefe project of ye ould deluder, Satan, to keepe men from the knowledge of ye Scriptures, as in former times by keeping ym in an unknowne tongue, so in these latter times by perswading from ye use of tongues, yet so at least ye true sence & meaning of ye originall might be clouded by false glosses of saint seeming deceivers, yet learning may not be buried in ye grave of our fathers in ye church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors.[4]

Moreover, the people were so determined to keep the school close to the heart of the Church that they required that teachers should be licensed to teach, except in the case of private teachers, and the minister was expected to examine the applicant and see whether he was "sound in the faith." It has been said by a profound student of education, "Had there not been Churches to recruit for, and a feeling of the deep importance of Church membership, there would have been little need for schools. It was the one compelling motive of the time for maintaining them."[5]

It is true that the education of this period is now regarded as having been unduly harsh in discipline, and probably out of harmony with many of the modern accepted pedagogical ideas. However, it should be remarked that, even though they did have whipping posts, there was at least the exercise of authority. Whether modern systems have drifted too far from handling the rising generation with a firm hand, is at least a matter worthy of deep consideration. It should

[4] Cubberly, "Readings in Education," p. 299.
[5] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 35.

be noted that this was a religious age, even if it may be called Puritanical; and it should not be forgotten that it laid the foundation for the greatest republic that has yet flourished in human history. Moreover, it should also not be forgotten that this republic itself was the greatest adventure in statecraft which has yet been made. It was the grand experiment that gave a new impetus to democracy throughout the world and has probably caused more crowns to fall than any other event in all the past.

Having reached the continental divide, figuratively speaking, or the summit of the dominance of the Church in education, we must now descend from this lofty plateau, noting the steps of our descent, to the present-day plain of education, largely, if not entirely, liberated from the supervision and direction of the Church. What are some of the causes which brought about the present situation? And here we pause to note that "the secularization of the schools," as a term, is not employed with the object of instituting any invidious contrast as between Church institutions and tax-supported schools of the State. We are dealing with certain facts of history and are noting certain results in modern life to-day, which are related to the problem that the Church and the State both face, and in which both are vitally and supremely interested. Indeed, our present-day problem and its solution are as necessary for the perpetuity of the State as they are for the survival of the Church.

In placing the finger of history upon the initial cause for the secularization of the schools, it may be more significant than a mere coincidence, when attention is cited to the fact that the primary cause was due to a decline in religious zeal and fervor. Civilization spread westward; men became more interested in building homes than in building houses of worship. The godly

zeal that had lit up the family altars of the Puritans did not burn as brightly in the second and third generations.

One has well said:

> These new towns in the wildnerness, owing their foundations to an entirely different cause than the original towns, and being founded by younger people who had never known European religious zeal or oppression, at once gave evidence of less interest in religion and learning than had been the case with the towns nearer the coast. Even these earlier coast towns, the second and third generation then in control, began to turn from religion and agriculture to shipping and commerce, and with the rise of trade new interests began slowly to displace the dominant religious concern of the early colonists.[6]

This growth of worldliness was reinforced by the downright want of religion. We are told by a competent student of history:

> By the beginning of the eighteenth century a change in attitude toward the old problem of personal salvation and church attendance became evident. New settlements amid frontier conditions, where hard work rather than long sermons and religious disputations were the need; the gradual rise of the civil as opposed to a religious form of town government; the increase of new interests in trade and shipping, and inter-colony commerce; the beginnings of the breakdown of the old aristocratic traditions and customs, originally transplanted from Europe; the rising individualism in both Europe and America—these all helped to weaken the hold on the people of the old religious doctrines.[7]

In addition to the worldliness and irreligion which had lowered the moral tone of the people in the Colonies, should be noted the fact that many paupers and criminals from English jails were being sent to the Central

[6] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," pp. 37-38.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

and the Southern Colonies, and that they, too, tended to lower both the educational ideals and the religious attitude of the country, and "new secular interests began to take the place of religion as the chief topic of thought and conversation."

"The secularization of the schools," then, may, in a sense, be regarded as the direct consequence of the preliminary secularization of the people. This secularization of the people is further evidenced by the fact that secular books now disputed the monopoly which the Bible had maintained. Then, too, Colonial newspapers, which in the main were secular, came to occupy the attention of readers, and by indirection, at least, replacing in part the attention which had been given to sacred literature.

Another cause of the secularization of the schools in America is to be found in the disintegration of the New England town. For the change which occurred there had its influence throughout the Colonies, and especially in that portion of our country which was settled most largely by emigrants from the New England States.

It is well to recall the situation that obtained in the New England town. Each New England settlement was a unit. It covered a territory of from twenty to forty square miles, in the center of which was placed the town site. The citizens were required to live, and this by law, within one-half mile of a meetinghouse, and to send their children to the town school. The meetinghouse usually stood at the center of the town and looked out on the town common. At first all town meetings were held in the churches.[8] It was the State acting for the Church which passed the law of 1642 and the law of 1647, requiring these towns to have schools for religious purposes. But as the towns grew and spread

[8] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," pp. 41-42.

out over a larger territory, it was necessary to establish district schools for the benefit of the pupils remote from the meetinghouse in the center of the town. It was here that the first step toward letting up in churchly supervision is to be noted. In all history it is not the most noticeable event that gives greatest room for pause, but it is the unnoted rule of action which, by the process of enlargement, marks a chasm of greatest contrast. Small issues result in wide divergences.

Another step in the process of weaning the school from the Church is to be found in the erection of a town hall, separate and distinct from the meetinghouse. The town hall became the center of gravity instead of the church. The interests of the school were no longer discussed where prayer was wont to be made, but where taxation was discussed, where lawbreakers received sentence, and where all of the secular affairs of the community were now being discussed. It is granted that there was no intention to leave the church out. But the church was left to one side, and it no longer figured in the same spirit and manner in the deliberations of the community as touching the school or anything else. Another building was being used. No psychologist is astute enough to measure the subtility of the influence of this migration from one building to another. So long as they were in the center of church, the church was in the center of their thoughts. But now that the church was no longer the central gathering place of the town with all of its interests, the center of gravity shifted to the town hall.[9]

Until now it was church taxes that had been voted for the school buildings and for school maintenance. In the town hall it was town taxes that were being voted for buildings and for maintenance. Here again we see a shifting from one servant to another in the service

[9] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," pp. 41-42.

of the people. The Church had been serving them in religion and in scholarship, but now the State steps in to render this service. Unconsiously, beneficiaries are likely to consider the hand that extends alms. While this may be a trivial point to stress, it is too important to pass unnoticed.

Supplementary to these processes already mentioned, should be added the introduction of new types of textbooks. For we must bear in mind that such books as the "New England Primer," regarding which it has been estimated that three million copies were sold, were almost entirely filled with religious content. It has been said of this Primer that "it taught millions to read, and not one to sin."[10] Following this, the Psalter, the Testament, and the Bible were read in the schools of the Colonies. But now there were introduced into the schools secular books that "began to dispute the earlier monopoly of the Bible."[11] So once more we see the advance of secularity, and in each instance this advance has been in keeping with the progress of the secularized attitude of mind and heart on the part of the people.

The newspapers of the time, assuming that they reflected the mind of the people, did not indicate a state of mind growing more intense in religious life. It is worthy of mention that while many daily papers originated, the first strictly religious journal did not appear until the *North American,* established in 1839. In so far, then, as the people were being furnished literature that, if not irreligious, was not positively religious, they were failing to be nourished in their spiritual life as before. So while the papers may have reflected the decline of the religious motive, they certainly did not aid in counteracting the forces affecting the diminished zeal.

[10] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 31.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 40.

The decline of the Latin Schools was no doubt due in part to the growth of what were regarded as more modern systems of education. Yet, inasmuch as these schools had existed primarily for the study of the classics in preparation of students for the ministry, we see less emphasis being placed upon schools with this distinct object in mind, and a larger emphasis upon the need of schools for other purposes.[12] Here, of course, it is well to bear in mind that there was need for a wider class of students in a growing community than those who were to become Churchmen. Nevertheless, there is betrayed the shifting of a moral attitude in the matter of emphasis upon certain studies which were in vital relation to the hitherto conceived best interest of the Church.

This of course was followed by the rise of a system of academies in keeping with the larger freedom which seemed to have been demanded. Then came "the establishment of two new colleges (Pennsylvania, 1749; Kings 1754), which from the first placed themselves in sympathy with the more practical studies; and the abandonment by Yale in 1767 and Harvard in 1773 of the practice of listing the students in the catalogue according to the rank and social standing of their parents."[13] Thus we see the school system yielding in all of its former customs to the growth of democracy and to the ever-increasing desire for greater freedom. We do not mean to say, however, that there were not many devout men who were greatly devoted to the Church and yet who believed that the progress of education in this wider way would continue to serve her. If they played any part in the secularization of the schools—that is to say, in the want of religious emphasis in education—they did this blindly and mistakenly. That the schools and colleges continued to have a larger liberty, freer from

[12] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 31.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

the direct influence of the Church, no one will deny.

Strange to say, the very section of our country that stood strongest for religious education in and through the schools was the very section that exerted the largest influence in extending free education to all the people. The fact is, the Calvinistic-Puritan States of New England had believed so firmly in education as an essential to salvation that they continued to support and encourage schools long after the religious motive, which had animated them in feeling the necessity for education as a part of salvation, had perished.[14] So these people, as they moved westward, carried the idea of extending education by means of the State. The heart of their religion was dead, but the momentum which at first interested them in education as a secondary consideration to that of the Gospel made them the mightiest force for establishing tax-supported schools upon the American continent. It was the tide of the New England emigrants that prevailed in the battle for tax-supported schools.[15]

In the South wealthy men sent their sons to England for their education anyway. Moreover, there were those who did not think it necessary that the masses should receive any considerable amount of intellectual training. Few of them were willing voluntarily to encourage the increased taxation necessary to promote such a system. Others, doubtless influenced by their relation to some private or sectarian school, were indisposed to do so. Many others were able to employ tutors for their children in their homes,and were hence not much concerned about the general discussion of this subject.

There originated a number of movements, however, which worked for the promotion of the public and free school idea; and, strange to say, the first of these move-

[14] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 71.
[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 74, 131, 134, 488.

ments was known as the Sunday School Movement. Robert Raikes, of Gloucester, England, in 1780, employed four women to teach the children, gathered in from the pin factories of that city, "in reading and the Church catechism." Here we note a strange contradiction: religion promoting education, and simultaneously driving the entering wedge eventually to be one of the causes ascribed among those making for the secularization of schools. True, these children were taught reading; but it is equally true that they were taught the Church catechism. And if Greene, the English historian, is right, it is none the less true that the movement did assist in leading the way from the Church domination of schools. Greene says: "The Sunday schools established by Raikes were the beginnings of popular education."[16]

Raikes's idea was developed in Virginia in 1786, in Charleston, S. C., in 1781, in Philadelplia in 1791, and in New York City in 1793. The latter was known as "Katy Ferguson's School for the Poor," and it was followed by an extension of "secular instruction among the poor."[17]

In 1797, at Pawtucket, R. I., Samuel Slater opened a school for factory operatives, which had much to do in obliterating class distinctions and preparing the way for a common day school.[18]

In the meantime, the Sunday school, in so far as it taught other subjects than those strictly religious, had met with opposition from the Churches. As a consequence, its field of activity became limited to religious training. As it gave rise to other societies formed to extend and carry on its work, such as the Evangelical Society of Philadelphia, the New York Sunday School Union, the Boston Society for the Moral and Religious

[16] Cubberly, "Public Instruction in the United States," pp.84-85.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Ibid.*

Instruction of the Poor, and the American Sunday School Union, it helped to pave the way for other societies interested in promoting week-day schools. For instance, "The Manumission Society," which was organized in New York in 1785, primarily to mitigate the evils of slavery, also had in mind the purpose "to give them the elements of an education." Then in 1801 we have the organization of the "Association of Women Friends for the Relief of the Poor." This Association employed a lady at thirty pounds a year to teach the children "good education and morals." All of these New York Societies were merged into the "Public School Society of New York" in 1805.[19]

Similar organizations were taking place in other cities. In Baltimore the "Benevolent Society of the City of Baltimore for the Education of the Female Poor" was founded in 1799. In the city of Washington the schools were started by subscription in 1804. In Philadelphia there was organized a "Society for the Free Instruction of Indigent Boys" in 1800. School societies were organized in Savannah in 1818, and in Augusta in 1821. Similar measures were taken in other sections of the country about this time.[20]

The whole system of free education, which was a prelude to the tax-supported system of schools, was greatly stimulated by the Lancastrian Monitorial System of instruction. Joseph Lancaster had gotten his idea from Dr. Andrew Bell, of England, who had hit upon it by experiment in an orphan asylum, in Madras, India. Dr. Bell published his account in England in 1797. This plan spread rapidly in this country. It was the cheapness of the system that appealed to the people. In a word, the plan was for the teacher to teach and coach a small group of picked boys, and then to sub-

[19] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," pp. 86-87.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

divide his school into different groups, and each of these to be in charge of one of these boys whom he had already specially prepared to teach the lesson. In this way one teacher could take care of a school of more than a hundred.[21]

The plan assisted in developing public interest in free schools primarily, but incidentally in education at large. As the cost of education had been one of the barriers in the way of securing taxation to carry on a free school system, the low rate provided by the Lancastrian Movement assisted to break down the tax barrier which had stood in the way.

The extension of the suffrage at once created a popular appeal for universal education. Up to 1815 only four States had granted the right to vote to all of its male citizens.[22] There were certain property or other considerations necessary for the exercise of the ballot. Furthermore, the growth of the cities, which has always been a strain upon the morality of the people, tended to break down the restraining influences at home, the moral code and religious atmosphere which had obtained, so that the streets were full of idle and ignorant children. Education was suggested as a possible remedy. The condition had reached such a point in New York City in 1833 that one-eighth of the population were public paupers and criminals, and there was a saloon for every eighty men, women, and children. To meet this situation the humanitarians, on the one hand, and the laboring classes on the other, joined in a propaganda for tax-supported schools.

Statesmen and politicians were led to take up the fight for tax-supported schools as a necessity for the proper exercise of the right of suffrage. Daniel Webster, in 1837, was led to remark:

[21] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," pp.90,93.
[22] *Ibid.* p. 108.

> Education, to accomplish the ends of good government, should be universally diffused. Open the doors of the schoolhouses to all the children in the land. Let no man have the excuse of poverty for not educating his offspring. Place the means of education within his reach, and if he remain in ignorance, be it his own reproach. . . . On the diffusion of education among the people rests the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions.[23]

Five years before this Abraham Lincoln had said:

> Upon the subject of education, not presuming to dictate any plan or system respecting it, I can only say that I view it as the most important subject which we as a people can be engaged in. That every man may receive at least a moderate education, and thereby be enabled to read the histories of his own and other countries, by which he may duly appreciate the value of our free institutions, appears to be an object of vital importance, even on this account alone, to say nothing of the advantages and satisfaction to be derived from all being able to read the Scriptures and other works, both of a religious and moral nature, for themselves.[24]

In this movement, thus far at least, probably no one concerned had any thought of secularizing the schools. For so long a time, education and religion had been so intimately related in the minds of the makers of opinion that they doubtless viewed any work done in either of these departments as having been done for both. Indeed, that there had silently crept into the motives of the propagandists the greater need for preparing future citizens rather than the distinct need of developing religious workers, seems not to have been noted by any, or, if so, by very few persons at that time. Statesmen and publicists were interested in the matter of democracy and the preparation necessary to maintain it. Economists were concerned about arresting poverty, while students of social science were mindful of the steps necessary to be taken to prevent crime. Men of

[23] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 113.
[24] *Ibid.*

widely different motives and of greatly different stations in life came together in this common call which appeared to be a cure for all of the ailments of the time.

With the modifying causes taking place abroad in the domain of education, and with the importation of these ideas through the stream of immigrants and through the books that came across, together with the changing life in America, we find a mighty impulse driving the Colonists to new experiments in education. It would be difficult to enumerate each and every factor and properly to appraise each one of them in trying to assign the reasons that drove us to tax-supported schools.

Among the arguments employed, it was affirmed that the Church and private schools had proved inadequate to meet the changing needs of society. Some declared that a system of religious schools was impossible in a mixed nation. Others claimed that education, such as was proposed by the free school system, would prevent pauperism and crime; would reduce poverty and distress; would increase production and wealth; and would promote democracy in a republic. They also argued that the presence of foreigners and the necessity for their assimilation required that free institutions of learning should be provided. They went so far as to take the position that public education was necessary as an act of self-preservation. They bolstered up their argument by maintaining that the right to hang implies the right to educate.

On the other hand, there were those who took the ground that public tax-supported schools would make education too common, and would also break down the social barriers that many of them thought should be maintained. There were others who maintained that the State had no right to interfere between the parent and the child in requiring that the children should

attend school. Still others thought that it was unfair for a man who had no children to be required by law to support the education being provided by the State for the children of other men. Then there were those who took the position that a State was justified in taxing itself for defense, but not in order to support benevolences; they construed the schools as being in the nature of a benevolence. Finally there were those who opposed the free school system out of deference to the private institutions already established, and their rights and equities incident thereto, and who also thought the new system might injure the Church schools.

Lined up in this contest for a free school system were to be found the city residents, intelligent workmen, nontaxpayers, and public men working in behalf of it, and being opposed by the rural residents, the aristocratic classes, and some of the denominations. So the battle went on with the victory going finally to those who represented the cause of tax-supported schools.

In the accomplishment of this there were well-defined propaganda programs put on, such as the Boston Society for the Diffusion of Knowledge, the American Institute of Instruction, the New Jersey Society of Teachers and Friends of Education, the Illinois Educational Convention, and the Hartford Society for the Improvement of Common Schools. In addition to these, there were the activities inspired from the Working Men's Associations, and from the recommendations of the governors. Their objectives were to secure tax support, to eliminate the pauper school idea, to make the schools entirely free, to establish State supervision, to do away with sectarianism, to extend the system upward, and to have the State university to complete the plan.

It is hardly necessary to recapitulate the means employed for raising the revenue in establishing the first of these schools. In some instances they were financed

by the proceeds from liquor licenses; in other instances by the licenses from theaters; in still other cases through the establishment of lotteries; then by bank taxes and national land grants; and finally by State taxation.

Legislation was started primarily in a permissive form —that is, leaving it open to the community to impose a tax if they so desired. This was an entering wedge, and prepared the way for universal taxation.

It is not necessary to note the development of tax-supported schools in each of the States. By 1850 there were 6,085 academies, with 12,260 teachers and 263,096 pupils. Many of these received some sort of State aid, and were under semi-public control. They represented the transition movement from the Latin school to the modern high school as we know it to-day. Not only so, but they represented a transition in matters of a religious nature also. They were the connecting link between the Church-dominated Latin grammar school and the modern high schools of to-day. This last statement will be appreciated more by reference to the aim of the academy as evidenced by Phillips Academy at Andover, Mass.[25]

> To lay the foundation of a public free school or ACADEMY for the purposes of instructing Youth, not only in English and Latin Grammar, Writing, Arithmetic, and those Sciences wherein they are commonly taught: but more especially to learn them the GREAT END AND REAL BUSINESS OF LIVING . . . it is again declared that the *first* and *principal* object of this Institution is the promotion of TRUE PIETY AND VIRTUE the *second*, instruction in the English, Latin, and Greek Languages, together with Writing, Arithmetic, Music, and the Art of Speaking the *third*, practical Geometry, Logic, and Geography and the *fourth*, such other liberal Arts and Sciences or Languages as opportunity and ability may hereafter admit, and as the TRUSTEES shall direct.[26]

[25] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 185.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

It is significant to note that the "great end and real business of LIVING" was esteemed to be "the promotion of true PIETY AND VIRTUE," so that the question intrudes itself into our mind as to whether or not the high schools of to-day have not only become secularized in the sense of having been made free from Church interference, but have become secularized in a more moral and religious sense in that they have lost the motive and objective indicated above.

A similar shifting of objectives has characterized the colleges as well as the high schools. In a pamphlet sent out by President Clap, of Yale, in 1754, he stated that "Colleges are *Societies of Ministers,* for training up Persons for the Work of the *Ministry.*" He also added: "The great design of founding this School (Yale) was to Educate Ministers in *our own Way.*" The advertisement in the New York papers announcing the opening of King's College (now Columbia University) in 1754, stated:

> The chief Thing that is aimed at in this College, is, to teach and engage the Children *to know God in Jesus Christ,* and to love and serve him in all *Sobriety, Godliness, and Richness* of Life, with a perfect Heart and a Willing Mind; and to train them up in all Virtuous Habits, and all such useful Knowledge as may render them creditable to their Families and Friends, Ornaments to their Country, and useful to the Public Weal in their generation.[27]

As a further evidence of lapse in moral objective, the requirements in the courses of study of the common schools may be pointed out. For instance, in most of the schools for younger children the item of "good behavior" was required, and certificates to this effect were given to the pupils. Moreover, in the class for the older children the department of "Manners and Morals" was in the schedule. In the last item in the courses of

[27] Cubberly, "Public Education in the United States," p. 201.

instruction carried on in the Lancastrian schools is the subject "Religion."

Going to Providence, R. I., where the graded system was early tried out, it is interesting to note that in the schedule of subjects in the common school for the year 1800 the "Bible" has its place along with the other branches studied in school. It does not appear thereafter in the courses offered. In the grammar school of 1840 "Practical Ethics" is found. This is the nearest approach to religion noted after 1800 in this school system.[28]

A student of education in this country, noting the evolution of the public school system after about 1840, or to the beginning of the city school supervision, says:

> There was also no change in method or purpose, except as the coming, about this time, of some Pestalozzian ideas . . . tended to improve all methods, and except as the elimination of sectarianism and the establishment of State-supported schools tended to give a clearer consciousness as to the citizenship-aim in instruction.[29]

However, this admission is the confession of "the elimination of sectarianism" and the substitution of "the citizenship-aim in instruction." This not only implies the secularization of the schools, but clearly indicates that the notions of citizens have replaced the ideas of the Churches. The question naturally arises whether or not there was a gain or a loss to the public good.

Most of our present system is hardly more than a hundred years old. Property became taxable in Ohio for school purposes in 1821. Four counties in Pennsylvania were allowed to organize for the education of school children in the same year. New York did not abolish the rate bill until 1868. Charleston, S. C., was

[28] Cubberly, Public Education in the United States," p. 227.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

permitted to provide free schools in 1856, though the present school system dates from 1868. The present system was largely initiated in the South after the Civil War.

Now, throughout this great country there are in every hamlet flourishing schools supported by the State. We all believe in education; the Church, the State, and society at large. We are all alike interested in the experiment that we are now making in the field of education. We say "experiment" advisedly. Indeed, as history runs, the commonly accepted policies of to-day are often repudiated to-morrow. After much toil and struggle, not only has free education been provided for the humblest of all races and classes, but most of them are required by law to secure such training as will prepare for intelligent citizenship. In addition to the common schools, all the States have their great institutions of learning, supported in large measure by taxation, so that higher education is now in reach of almost every earnest boy or girl. Ignorance has in large measure been abolished, and yet society in America to-day faces the greatest questions that have ever challenged statesmen, educators, ministers, and criminologists. Have we created a Frankenstein that will prove greater than its author?

CHAPTER III

THE MERITS OF SECULARIZED EDUCATION EXAMINED

We must all come to judgment, the individual, the institution, and the nation. Enough time has elapsed since the secularization of the schools in America to determine their relation to the drift of the times. That there has been great advance in the dissemination of learning there can hardly be any doubt. Whether progress has been made in the development of the individual pupil or not, the extensive aspect of education in reaching a larger number is true. But our concern is not primarily with reference to the number that have learned to read and to write. Our chief concern is with reference to the reaction of students in terms of moral value and as measured by the test of citizenship.

It is true that society has advanced in many ways. Better provision is being made for the orphan. Charitable and religious enterprises receive large benefactions. There has been a marked advance in the erection of public buildings, in the matter of transportation, in building good roads, and in all of those improvements that make for a larger efficiency. It is true that some of these public improvements are being made at the cost of placing a mortgage on the property that will be owned by our children. Moreover, there are fewer forms of rank brutality on the streets, and society has covered its ulcerated heart with a beautiful veneer.

We do not belong to that school of believers that think all is right with the world because God is in his

heaven. If this were true, the unspeakable suffering and death of his son would have been a mere spectacle rather than a tragedy. The world was lost and Christ came to save it. It was an admission on the part of the Deity of the impotency of mankind, unaided, to rescue anything. This has been a wicked world since the fall of Adam. The question that concerns us now is whether the world is growing better or worse. We know that we enjoy better conveniences, and perhaps have better advantages than ever in the past. We have our electric lights, our well-appointed bathrooms; our table linen is more plentiful and of better quality. These things make for our physical comfort and happiness. Our real concern, however, is to know whether at heart the world is more honest, more genuine, more just, more righteous, and more possessed of the spirit of martyrdom than it was, say, a hundred years ago.

It is easy to allege, but difficult to prove, anything. That matters of evidence may be brought forward in rebuttal of some of the items herewith presented, we do not deny. But that there will be still enough left beyond peradventure of dispute to make our hearts sick, we must admit.

It would be unjust to place the whole responsibility on the school system. Our job is to apportion the guilt to the Church, the home, and the school. We have placed these three institutions in this order because we cannot get anywhere without an adequate conception of God. The Church must therefore always stand first. The home is the oldest institution that God ever made; it is the first with which the new citizen has to do. He is a son in his father's house before he learns anything else regarding the unfriendly influences of the world. It therefore comes second. And now that the Church and the home have very largely turned over the work of training the children to the public schools,

this institution should certainly come third in order and rival the others in point of importance.

But how are we getting along? The *Literary Digest* of March 31, 1923, says: "The Augean stables of modern literature require a modern Hercules to clean them, in the opinion of a New York judge and a number of like-minded men, who have formed a Clean Books League." It quotes the Charleston *News and Courier* as saying that no one who gives the matter any thought "can doubt that the flood of nastiness in books is really one of the gravest problems of these times, and no decent man or woman who has any conception of the gravity of it is going to try to hinder any worth-while effort to solve that problem in so far as it can be solved. The main thing is to convince the people, including the literary columnists and her critics, that the right method, or at any rate a promising method, has been found." Again, quoting from the *Digest*, we read:

> What the New York jurist demands is what the country needs, says the Richmond *News Leader*, and that is, "some guaranty that periodicals and booksellers will not be able to recommend or to sell to young readers improper books." In contradistinction to some writers, who are "artists, read by people who are not affected by a frank treatment of sex," there are "some scores of young authors in America who are writing neither literature nor science, but naked, ugly filth, and are writing it solely because it gets them an audience (such as it is) they cannot procure by any honorable effort." These are the men, in the main, we are told, whose books "some conscienceless publishers and dealers are pushing—even on adolescents. It is preposterous to view the restraint of these filth-mongers as an invasion of the liberty of the press." To any one born before 1890 it is "dizzying," says the Newark *News* referring to some of the recent novels as "fair orgies of sensuality." In fact, we are told, one cannot name offhand many books of current popularity that are not of this order. "American, English and French writers are vying to gain readers by such methods. Practically nothing is left unsaid—even

> insisted upon. Physiology is ransacked for theses, and the realm of psychology is stript to the bone. Men and women discuss basic instincts with each other, and what they neglect to say the author supplies in the context."

Rev. John E. Brown, President of the International Federation of Christian Workers, in his book entitled "Slime Pits," quotes from the San Francisco *Chronicle* in reference to the film stars and their friends:

> The cavortings at one affair in which more than a hundred stars of the silent drama participated are now the talk of the town, and the unwritten annals of the celebration of the Lewd One Hundred are blazoned as the unsurpassed midnight funeral. The scene was set in the palatial home of one of the heroes of the hundred million film fans of the nation. The sumptuous and spacious living room of the residence, laid with carpets and arranged with parlor furniture, the cost of which runs to a fortune, was the stage of the festivities for the film stars, whose aggregate salaries each year were estimated to total many millions of dollars. The party gained early headway, its participants enjoying entertainment and pre-Volstead refreshments, which only the lavish hand of overweighted wealth can provide. Weird oriental dances performed by entertainers in or near the state of complete nudeness were the send-off for the evening in the line of amusement, watched and tempestuously applauded by many bold, unrighteous heroes and demure and retiring heroines that the film fans know so well.[1]

We quote from the same paper in reference to the "lewd one hundred" of the film colony at Los Angeles:

> Men rushed to the women present at the party, tearing off their scant dresses. The party ended hours later after an orgy which is declared to be without equal in the history of western America. Participants of these parties of excesses are limited to approximately one hundred and twenty-five members of the motion picture colony, but their orgies in palatial residences which they have rented, causing destruction of furniture and interior decorations,

[1] Brown, "Slime Pits," pp. 112-113.

> have so reflected upon the reputation of the great body of screen actors that many of them are unable to rent homes at any price in Los Angeles. While arrests have been made as a result of one party which in its sensuality surpassed and paled the color of the most "gorgeous" Parisian affairs, Los Angeles authorities have never secured a single conviction, due, it is declared, that in one case all parties arrested forfeited bail amounting to thousands of dollars by failing to appear in court. It is also said that several witnesses essential to the prosecution were bought off and told to "take your vacation," or refused to testify.[2]

Quoting from the *Literary Digest* of February 17, 1923, we read:

> Speaking recently in New York, Judge Lindsey said that for every marriage in Denver in 1922 there has been a separation. For every two marriage licenses there has been a divorce suit filed. "Think of it," he exclaims, as he is quoted in press reports. "In the last four years the marriage and divorce rate has changed from four to one or two to one. These statistics show the number of separations from non-support and desertion which have come under the observation of my Domestic Relations Court. In Chicago last year," he proceeds, "reports showed that there were 39,000 marriage licenses granted and 13,000 divorce decrees signed. Remember that the decrees signed did not represent all of those filed, nor the large number of separations. You see at once how lamentably marriage has failed." Another tendency indicated by Judge Lindsey is the actual decrease in the number of marriage licenses issued, to explain which he says that many persons are dispensing with what he calls "the conventional formality of marriage. In 1920 there were 4,002 marriage licenses issued in Denver. Compare that with the 3,008 in 1922, and it makes you think, doesn't it?"

From the above statement, coming as it does from an authoritative source, it would appear that one of the three institutions upon which society must depend is in danger of falling into ruin. When there is a divorce

[2] "Slime Pits," 124-125.

in the United States of America taking place every fifteen minutes, and when every ninth couple united by the vows of the Church are afterwards separated by the force of the law, the time has come when the optimist must strain his faith a little to see the future painted in roseate hues.

But this is not all. So much of the institution as remains is in large measure failing to function. When we are told that from the graduates of the leading colleges for women in this country the average increase in progeny is only one and a half per student, we see that the fundamental conception of the Maker is being thwarted by human purpose and malice aforethought. Neither is this all. Of those that survive how many are carrying forward the religious ideals of the home? There was a time when the head of the house was supposed to be a priest at his own fireside. True, there are a number of families in almost every community that still have family worship and try to keep alive those religious influences that have always enriched and elevated the moral and religious life of a people; yet the number of these is relatively so small that we have a feeling of discouragement in this particular as well.

Then in addition to this, when we are told that there are 65,000 missing girls and women lost to view every twelve months, or an average of 170 a day, we realize that there is a powerful undercurrent somewhere biting away at the foundation of our social structure. As to how far the modern dance, the movies, the theater, and other worldly, ambitious influences are contributing to our undoing, no man can measure. Besides, when we take into consideration the kind of songs that are sung, the ragtime, the jazz music, and the amount and character of flippant and perfidious literature that is coming

from the press of the land, we begin to see some of the problems with which we have to deal.

That there is a want of energy, thrift, and serious purpose, no one can deny. Laziness has not usually been deemed a crime, but the time may yet come when the possession of great wealth will not be accepted as a proper excuse in a life of idleness and indolence. There is something in the adage that an idle brain is the devil's workshop; and those who are demanding leisure of any kind are exposed to great temptations and to dangerous devices.

Dr. Copeland, former health officer of New York City, now a United States Senator, in an interview[3] sometime ago pointed to the foreign quarters of Greater New York, and showed that the average birth-rate was more than great enough to offset the deaths. Then pointing to the American colony, he showed what we were doing by way of contrast, drawing attention to the fact that our increase was not sufficient to offset our loss. Speaking to a young lady, the wife of a cashier, who was living in an apartment, he asked her why she did not keep house, and remarked upon the fact that she had no child. She replied by saying that the cost of maintaining a servant was too great. He then asked her if her mother kept a servant. She replied, "no," but added: "The times are different." And so they are; and that is just the reason that we are calling attention to these terrible facts which indicate with what certainty and rapidity we are rushing to a social downfall.

But the question arises, what has this to do with our public schools and with our colleges? It has to do both with the home and with the schools, and also with the Church. About a year ago considerable discussion followed the exposure of moral conditions in the public

[3] *The Dearborn Independent*, July 7, 1923, p. 11.

schools of a great city in this country. The papers generally commented upon the facts brought out. We give herewith an article which appeared in the Greenville, S. C. *News* relative to exposures recently brought out in Birmingham, Ala., by the Birmingham *News*. The age of these children would indicate that both the school and the home have been unfaithful, and perhaps the Church as well. Incidentally, a few remarks by a sensible woman are included—but here is the communication:

> The *News* has published recently several editorials and news articles from the Birmingham *News* relating to the shocking revelations discovered in an investigation of road-houses on highways outside of Birmingham. In such a clean-up one would expect to find gilded denizens of the underworld, besotted ne'er-do-wells, and cauliflower-eared gunmen. But when the officers began to throw the spotlight on Birmingham's risque amusement places, what did they discover? Not these proverbial habitues, but young girls of some of Birmingham's best families not out of their 'teens carousing with sleek pompadoured youths who were the sons of bankers and prominent merchants.
>
> It was a solar plexus blow to Birmingham, and the newspapers have printed columns of discussion about it. As usual, not a little abuse was heaped upon officers for allowing such resorts to flourish to the ruination of young people. But there is one sensible woman in Birmingham who put her finger on the soft spot. Said she: "Parental discipline is as obsolete as horse-hair furniture and the family album. Mothers are mothers in name only, and the home, alas; is only a hollow mockery of its intended purpose, a place merely filling the material necessity for existence. The holy purpose carved for a divine destiny gone—gone! And with it our decency, our beloved, cherished ideals. The child who appreciates the loving guidance of parental influence is fairly safe from the pitfalls. It is strictly up to the parents. The parents of to-day are not acquainted with the whereabouts nor companions of their children. They seem to stand in awe, and timorous before these very charges. A man calls in staccato voice over the phone, a 'date' is made for the

> evening, and when the hour arrives the man 'toots' his horn and the girl jumps off like a frenzied toad; the engine jerks and snorts and off they go—God knows where! The purity of young girlhood, whose very presence has ever hallowed the world with an indefinable touch of subtle mystery and charm! A thing potently exquisite! The hint of the lily with the fragrance of roses clung about her! Shall this be blemished? Can't we rally about the home and make it more of a real, integral part of our lives and less of a casually, non-considered incidental? For the base must be reached and struck at before we can expect to prune the evil at the top.'' And with this plea, this writer ends her discussion: ''The home! God save it from desecration!''
>
> Unquestionably this is an old-fashioned mother who thinks more of her children than she does of her bridge score. ''If a woman be acclaimed the greatest success in all her outside endeavors and fails in the making and shaping of her God-given sphere, she makes for the poorest, most ignominious failure in the world,'' she argues. And though ultra-modernists may scoff at her and read her out of their logic, her sense of proportion is sustained by Nature, God, and all the wise men who have lived in the world.
>
> Where that wandering boy or girl is to-night, is the most important question any parent has to answer.

But to cover this phase of the discussion would require a book. We will have to content ourselves with simply intimating the fields for investigation before us.

Whether it is relevant or not to discuss doctrine in connection with this subject, certain facts indicate that it is. If forty per cent of the young men and women, according to statements given out by an extreme modernist, abandon the faith of their childhood while going through college, it is time to inquire what effect this will have upon the Church back home and upon society at large.[4] Parents do not send their children to college

[4] Clark, ''Talking Points,'' p. 26 (Taken from Professor Leuba's book).

for the purpose of having the faith which they have inculcated corrupted or destroyed.

If heretical professors are to be allowed to promulgate their views, which are regarded as detrimental to religion by many good people, then at least the orthodox professor should not be under any restraint in announcing the faith as received by our fathers. It does seem incongruous that utmost liberty should be allowed in teaching all of the hypotheses of men, and in unfolding the laws of God in the case of flowers and animals, and yet require a "speak-easy" policy in matters of religion. Is not the life of a soul of more consequence than that of a plant?

Besides, is not a great deal of the new doctrine taught by the extreme modernists simply old-time infidelity under a new form? Indeed, the consistency in thinking purely as an intellectual act on the part of some of these extreme modernists may be brought into question. Take the case, for instance, of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, in connection with two pronouncements.

In his famous sermon, "The New Knowledge and the Christian Faith," Dr. Fosdick says:

> ONE POINT OF VIEW—THE FUNDAMENTALIST'S
>
> Here, for example, is one point of view: that the virgin birth is to be accepted as historical fact; it actually happened; there was no other way for a personality like the Master to come into this world except by a special biological miracle. That is one point of view, and many are the gracious and beautiful souls who hold it.
>
> But, side by side with them in the evangelical Churches is a group of equally loyal and reverent people who would say that the virgin birth is not to be accepted as an historical fact.[5]

Again, in this same sermon, he gives the point of view of the Liberals more definitely:

[5] Reprinted from a sermon preached at the First Presbyterian Church, New York, May 21, 1922, "The New Knowledge and the Christian Faith," p. 9.

ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW—THE LIBERAL'S

> Knowing this, there are within the evangelical Churches large groups of people whose opinion about our Lord's coming would run as follows: those first disciples adored Jesus—as we do; when they thought about his coming they were sure that he came specially from God—as we are; this adoration and conviction they associated with Gods special influence and intention in his birth—as we do; but they phrased it in terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use.[6]

Bearing the statements of this sermon in mind, let us quote Dr. Fosdick in a subsequent deliverance:

> If you are going to rule out as impossible all the things that strain your imagination, you are going to fall far behind the march of present-day science. The scientist tells me that the head of a common pin is a universe, that inside it millions of atoms move in regular cycles, like the planets in the skies. I have seen it stated that two hundred and fifty thousand years would be required to count the atoms in the head of a pin. To me that is inconceivable; it exceeds my powers of imagination. Yet I do not reject the scientist's assurance as untrue because I find difficulty in imagining it.[7]

Taking these two statements from the same person, but made at different times, we face the question as to whether or not the leader of the extreme modernists is either a logical or a safe thinker. In the former case he balks on the orthodox conception of the virgin birth because "they phrased it in terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use." Yet, in the second instance, when considering the statement of the scientist, "that the head of a common pin is a universe, that inside it millions of atoms move in regular cycles, like the planets in the sky," and that it would take "two hundred and fifty thousand years . . . to count the atoms in the head of a pin," he says: "I do not reject

[6] "The New Knowledge and the Christian Faith," p. 10.
[7] *The Literary Digest*, p. 36, March 17, 1923.

the scientist's assurance as untrue because I find difficulty in imagining it."

Now, may the author inquire, why so little difficulty in believing a statement of a scientist, though "it exceeds my powers of imagination," yet at the same time unable to accept a historic fact based upon the inspired word of God, accepted by devout men of all ages, and clearly associated with revelation?

Unfortunately, this is not the only instance where this leader of the extreme modernists has displayed a want of logic in his thinking. For instance, in his book on prayer, in one place he says: "The first is the idea that praying is an attempt to secure from God, by begging, something which God had not at all intended, or had intended otherwise. But Christian prayer is never that."[8] Again, Dr. Fosdick says: "Christian prayer is giving God an opportunity to do what he wants, what he has been trying in vain, perhaps for years, to do in our lives, hindered by our unreadiness, our lack of receptivity, our closed hearts and unresponsive minds."[9]

If Dr. Fosdick is correct in his first statement, it would appear that he is incorrect in the second. If prayer does not get from God what he did not intend to give, how can prayer then make it possible for God to do "what he has been trying in vain, perhaps for years, to do in our lives"? Moreover, if this first statement touching prayer is true, then the parable of Jesus concerning the importunate widow is false. It clearly teaches that one does get what was not intended.

Attention has been given to the mental processes of this outstanding leader of the extreme modernists because he would rob Christianity of some of its dearest faiths. This sort of thing is subversive of morality and religion, and does nothing to build up either scholar-

[8] "The Meaning of Prayer," p. 63.
[9] *Ibid.*

ship or the kingdom of God. There is strength in faith, but there is no power in unbelief. Might we not inquire if the extreme type of modernism is not little less than a series of negations? Can one point to a sweeping revival of religion having been held by a single teacher of extreme modernistic views? No doubt the positions taken by these brethren may interest the mental side of curious-minded hearers. Their views may even delight cultured heretics who are waiting to find comfort in some substitute for a pure heart and an obedient life.

Sound sense and religion, as well as the rights of parents and the interests of education, require that developing childhood and young womanhood and manhood shall be protected from views that are extraneous to science and in conflict with revelation, and which weaken the faith of the young and logically and naturally carry with it the forces that make for morality. To argue that it is outside of the province of the State, if logical, would require that police powers also be abolished. Our streets are patrolled to protect citizens from highwaymen. Shall not our schools and colleges be protected in those things that are more sacred than even life itself? Is it legal to do this? Article Three of the Ordinance of 1787 says: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." The separation of Church and State "does not mean that the American State shall not consciously rest itself in a definite religious faith." Moreover, "it is not un-American for the President of the United States to take the oath of office on the Holy Bible, nor for the Congress, State legislatures, and political conventions to open their daily sessions with prayer."[10]

[10] Millier, "The Teaching of High School Subjects," pp. 427-428.

Prof. George R. Wells, Ph.D., does not think that the whole realm of truth can be placed under one term known as "science." He says:

> There is a third way in which the term "science" is widely and most unjustifiably used. That is the usage which makes the term and its derivatives almost synonymous with "worth while," "genuine," or "valuable." In this connection it becomes a term of opprobrium to speak of any process or act as unscientific. But to say that a process or act is unscientific is simply to say that it is non-equational. Beyond any doubt there are very many activities of men which are of the utmost value to mankind which are not scientific and are not capable of ever becoming scientific. Included in such activities are art, ethics, law, and religion.[11]

He further says:

> But science and religion divide between them the field of reality, and therefore are in no sense rivals, but, facing the same foe, unfortunately far from dead, are the closest allies.

The test of anything is its results. Therefore the question arises, whether the system which has been employed in our public schools and colleges is securing the results along moral and religious lines that we have a right to expect. Quoting from the general organ of a great denomination, we learn something of the ignorance of religious matters, as evidenced from a questionnaire sent out from a Teachers' College in Missouri. Here it is:

> Ever so often reports appear telling of tests of Bible knowledge. The latest comes from Missouri. Certain questions about the Bible were asked by the State Teachers' College at Warrensburg, Mo. The questions were given to one hundred students in the college and to the students of six high schools in cities in Missouri. The report says: "Sixteen per cent of the students neither knew where Christ was born nor the name of his mother. Sixty per cent

[11] *The Homiletic Review*, February, 1924, pp. 102-103.

> knew not that Peter, James, and John enjoyed the larger confidence of Jesus. Seventy per cent did not know what to call the Sermon on the Mount. Sixty per cent did not know what Christ said about loving one's neighbor. Twelve per cent did not know the first clause of the Lord's Prayer. Sixty-five per cent did not know the Golden Rule.'' [12]

Assuming that a large degree of this ignorance of the Bible rests on the failure of the home to perform its part in giving religious instruction, does it not make it all the more obligatory that the school shall step in and attempt to do what it can to perfect our future citizens? It will not be denied that the schools are giving large attention to save the physical health of the rising generation. In many of these schools free lunches are served, and in some cases where the students not able to purchase pure milk, it is supplied also. But why be so much concerned about supplying milk and soup, and at the same time leaving the soul to starve?

Let us repeat once more that we may not be able to apportion on a percentage basis the measure of guilt that attaches to the home, to the Church, and to the school. However, these three fundamental institutions are so interlocked that a failure in either one necessarily affects the whole. Considering as we now are. ''The Merits of Secularized Education,'' we cannot escape the comparison between this system and the early form of education, which was promoted almost entirely, if not exclusively, by the Church, and which had for its objectives fundamentally the religious idea even with greater emphasis than the mere mental enlightenment.

That this responsibility must be faced and met is evident from an article in the *Literary Digest* of March 22, 1924, headed ''Our Share in the Murderer's Guilt'':

> Four young men were sentenced to death the other day in Brooklyn, and the grim tragedy in the still

[12] *Christian Advocate* (General Organ of the M. E. Church, South).

courtroom was the grimmer in that it might have been prevented. In cold blood and after long deliberation, these young men had murdered and robbed two bank messengers in a Brooklyn elevated station. Thus six lives are taken away, and the guilt is fastened not alone on the four young criminals, three of them hardly more than boys, but primarily upon the American public conscience. The method of their upbringing was wrong, as it is wrong to-day, we are told, everywhere in the land—evidenced in the national scandals which have exposed a cesspool of corruption, in the courts of every large city, in the reformatories, in the jails, in the prisons. The fact is brought out in our issue of March 15; it is brought out again in this because just now the subject is forcibly engaging the attention of our religious leaders, jurists, editors, and journalists, all faced suddenly, it seems, by the appalling tragedy presented by a feeble public conscience which has almost discarded every form of religious and moral instruction and surrendered the home as the main-stay of virtue. No nation, we are told, can depend on its police system to preserve its moral fiber. The gallows and the chair are sorry substitutes for the Sunday school and the old-fashioned altar of maternal knees. The problem is long past the debating stage, and earnest thinkers of the three great branches of religion embraced in American life, both clerical and lay, are seeking some method whereby American youth may be saved from the wanton neglect which in so many cases ends in a lonely cell or in legal execution.

This article went on to say that Justice James C. Cropsey, after sentencing them, said that he would not let the occasion pass without comment. The Judge had in mind the fact that three of them were but little more than twenty-one years of age, and the fourth one only a little older, yet two of them had served terms of imprisonment, and the other two had been long associated with criminals. He also remarked upon the age of the offenders as not being unusual, and said:

Most of the criminals are boys and young men. To be exact, over eighty per cent of them are less than twenty-five years of age. If the people of

Brooklyn ask why so many youths become criminals, I can tell them. A dozen years of investigation and experience in these matters have demonstrated that the vast majority of all the youthful offenders committed crime because they had bad associates and were not under the proper influences in the years when boyhood was turning into manhood—between the ages of twelve and eighteen. That is the most important period in a boy's life. Then his ideals are acquired, his character formed.

This condition is a challenge to the manhood of our community. What are we men doing? Tens of thousands of boys are nightly on our streets looking for amusement, seeking adventure, yearning for companionship. Many of them have no fathers, and the parents of many others give little or no heed to the places their boys visit or the companions they choose. Do we men owe no duty to these boys? Can we longer remain blind to the perils that beset them? Should we not provide places where such boys may meet and play and be entertained and instructed, and all the time be under the influence of men of the right kind?

This is a practical thing. It can be done. It has been done in a small way and with wonderful results. Why should not we undertake it in a big way? We can lessen the crimes in our midst by giving our attention to the youths. They need a man's guiding hand and helpful personality. They need the example of a true man's life in forming their character.

Brooklyn can be made better. Whether it will, depends upon us, its men. Shall we turn our backs and ignore existing conditions or shall we accept the challenge and lend ourselves to the task? It's a man's job and it needs red-blooded men who will put something of themselves into the undertaking.

Men, this is a call to us. Are we awake? Do we hear it? Will our consciences let us ignore it? Shall we not help to make better the boys of today? Should we not begin at once?

This same article quotes Rev. Walter M. Howlett, Secretary of the Religious Education Department of the New York Federation of Churches and of the Metropolitan Federation of Daily Vacation Bible Schools, as saying that regular hours of worship will be observed

daily in combining systematic instruction, in spiritual things, and will shortly be included in the routine of instruction of all children of public school age in New York City. It is said that Protestants, Catholics, and Jews will join in the movement.

We are also told that Mr. Howlett gave out an interview in the New York *World* in which he said in part:

> Under the circumstances we can hardly wonder that the moral condition of large groups of young people, especially in our American cities, is giving cause for alarm. They are lacking in reverence. Their sense of the sacred has never been developed. They do not know the attitude of worship. They have no conscious knowledge of God.
>
> Looking at it only in its social aspect, this has brought about an unendurable situation. Such crimes as that of the Diamond brothers make us realize with a shock this utter lack of moral sense within a section of our community. Those boys happen to be Jews, but their partners in crime came from Catholic and Protestant homes. We Protestants have hitherto centered our thoughts upon extending Protestant religious education. To-day we must see the equal necessity of the Catholic and Jewish children developing *their* religious life.

The statement is also made that, while Archbishop (now Cardinal) Hayes is not pessimistic, yet he says:

> The very fact that the situation is being recognized so clearly is cause for congratulation. But there is no time to be lost. Whatever one's religious views may be, all must agree that it is not fair to the children to neglect them as they are being neglected to-day. That it is not fair to society at large is also true, but my heart aches for the little ones. They need God in their young lives. They need spiritual guidance. They need to be delivered from the aimlessness and boredom, to say nothing of the more acute tragedies, of the godless life.
>
> Socially, also, this involves much more than the problem of crime. Even without the murders and atrocities which so shocked us lately, there would still be an urgent social need to resume religious

> instruction generally. Where there is no religion there is no purpose in life. And modern life wofully lacks purpose.

Also, William McAdoo, Chief City Magistrate of New York City, is quoted as saying:

> This army of young criminals is emotionally deficient; that is, they are strangers to love, affection, pity, sympathy, friendship, charity, kindness, temperance, and chastity.

The views introduced here are from sources worthy of fair and reasonable consideration, to say the least of it. One man might be wrong, but too many men to-day are thinking along the lines of the problem herein introduced for it to be cast aside as having no merit in it.

The extent to which crime characterizes the American people should at least afford food for serious thought. The *Dearborn Independent* of September 22, 1923, states: "There are twenty times as many murders in New York City every year as there are in all England, Scotland, and Wales. There are ten times as many murders in Chicago every year as in all France." Statements of this sort are so serious that there must be an explanation adequate to solve the problem.

We may weaken our personal feeling of responsibility by thinking of the polyglot population that is proving a curse to our civilization, and which will likely continue unless statesmen come to have more influence in Washington, and are able to place more restrictions on immigration that will be effective at least to some degree. But even the presence of a large percentage of the riffraff of Europe will not clear up the problem with the young life of America. Granting that a portion of the youth guilty of crime are the children of foreign-born, ordinarily deep-dyed criminals are not expected to reach this age until a later period in life.

Yet here we have the average age of all criminals at approximately twenty years and eleven months. It has been suggested that the habitués of the underworld are at an age several years younger than this. Crime now reaches down toward the cradle and covers, in a large measure, those of the high-school age.

The situation at Birmingham, Ala., is not an isolated one. Some two or three years ago, in the city of Nashville, Tenn., after a party given to the young people in the most exclusive club of that city, controlled by the ladies, and in the dressing rooms of the girls were found nineteen "empties" and one broken bottle. A great hue and cry was raised from some of the mothers of that city; but, as a lawyer once said to the writer, "It is too late to lock your stable door when the horse is gone."

But this is not all. In another Southern State, upon the authority of a man high up in educational circles, we are told of conditions at a swimming resort near a prosperous little city that are almost beyond possible belief, which would be doubted were it not for the source of this information. But what is going on here is doubtless going on in a thousand other vicinities in this great republic.

What about the Teapot Dome and the Oil Scandal?—"Who killed Smith, the long-time associate and friend of the Attorney General of the nation? Or did he commit suicide? High life, politics, and commerce are all suffering from a want of moral and religious principle Here we see the result of neglect yesterday, and we also see men in influence who are failing to set the example in the matter of honesty, uprightness, and integrity for the oncoming generation. In the first place, these people have not the disposition to teach morality, and could not reach it were they to try. It would be necessary for them first to get right in their

own hearts and lives before playing the rôle of religious patrons. So we have society playing loose at the top and at the head of the procession, while the young life is playing fast and furious. What will become of to-morrow?

It needs no argument to say that the youth of to-day will determine the world of to-morrow. If, then, we are to take the matter of statistics, in crime, in the underworld, dishonesty in public life, as proof, we can readily see that there has already occurred great neglect. Possibly the home is guilty, possibly the Church is guilty in not maintaining a more orthodox faith, and in pressing the evangelistic phases of religion with greater aggression, and finally the school must take over its part in sharing the guilt that now lies at the door of these three institutions. Just to what extent the secularization of the schools in America has increased this guilt, we may not be able to determine by any mathematical statement. Yet it is fair to conclude that if the same emphasis had been given to the Psalter, to the Catechisms, and to the religious emphasis which was placed in the early days of this country, and which is generally admitted to have played its part in developing the great leaders that made our national greatness possible, possibly to-day we would not be humiliated with the degradation that now confronts us. Moreover, if we have gotten under headway with such rapidity in a few decades, where will we be in a century or so?

A writer in the *Christian Advocate,* the general organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of June 2, 1922, says:

> Most of the young people of to-day are drifting aimlessly, like a ship without a rudder, or groping blindly for something, they know not what, like a man lost in a dense forest without a compass and seeking for any kind of help, guide, or shelter.

> They lack principles, ideals, and a well-defined goal. . . .
>
> The present generation pride themselves on their scorn of the conventions and their honesty. Like savages, they choose dances that give free expression to their emotions, and girls wear dresses that allow them liberty of motion. They do not know the meaning of the words "rest" and "repose"; they are ever striving for something. They often remind me of a picture I once saw in an old English inn. It was called "The Pursuit of Pleasure" and represented a crowd of all kinds of people following and trying to touch a beautiful woman that was floating just beyond and above them.
>
> At the same time, the young people of to-day are in reality no fonder of pleasure than their ancestors; they simply have been surfeited with materialism and starved spiritually. They have not become acquainted with their souls—in fact, many do not know that they possess one. The soul belongs to eternity and the unseen world, so time and matter cannot satisfy it. The Bible is the link between humanity and divinity, and without it none can answer the call of the soul which sometimes becomes so insistent that the body is unconsciously sacrificed to its needs, when we call it "suicide."

We are told in this same paper, of December 22, 1922, that a committee consisting entirely of educators, appointed by the Board of Education in England, after referring to the Bible as "the most majestic thing in our literature and the most spiritually living thing we inherit," said:

> For five centuries and more no other English book has been so widely read in this island nor so closely connected with our national life nor has left so strong a mark upon the mass of our literature. . . . At the present time the Bible is probably less widely read and less directly influential in our life and literature than it has been at any time since the Reformation. . . . We are continually less and less familiar with the one great piece of literature which for centuries gave something of a common form, a common dignity to the thought and speech of the people.

So it would appear that the Bible is being neglected both in America and in Great Britain. The unrest in this country at least, and the predominance of crime, would indicate, if possible, either a greater neglect in moral and religious education here, or in the reading of the Word of God.

But in our boasted religious freedom it would seem that we are trying to get away from the very appearance of morality and religion. After reading very carefully the Research Bulletin of the National Education Association for September, 1923, on such topics as "What Are the Weak Spots in Our Public School System?" "What National Defects Result from the Weak Spots in Our Public School System?" "How May Our Public School System Be Strengthened?" About the nearest approach to anything that suggested, directly or indirectly, religious contact or influence, was this: "The proper training of the children of the nation requires a close cooperation between the home and school. This cooperation can exist only when parents are thoroughly familiar with school conditions." And even here it will be noted that the primary motive would seem to be for the school's sake rather than for the sake of the child. Therefore it is well to suggest that it might be a sound educational policy, as well as good pedagogy, to apply the principle involved when Jesus said, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Our schools are made for the pupils; when right results are not obtained, they have failed. It is results that we are working for.

Why should we be so anxious to have so much religious freedom, and be so careful not to encroach upon the religious domain? May there not be another reason beyond the legal liberties that we have? May not the real reason be one of indisposition and of unconcern, if not positive antagonism in some instances, to the faith

once delivered to the fathers? The want of reverence may be an index of pure irreverence. Dr. G. Campbell Morgan is reported as saying:

> But the tendency to-day is not to retire Jesus because of overemphasis on reverence. On the other hand, the disease to-day is to deny that there is a mystery. This movement began with an insistence of the nearness of Jesus to human experience. It grew out of an attempt to get back to an understanding of the human Jesus. The Unitarians gave us this—the conception of the humanity of Jesus—but this is only a half truth; the human side is not all. There is no greater misrepresentation than that Jesus is a mere man; there is no mystery.
>
> Modernism began by saying we must get him back within human touch. I can more readily understand the reverence that retired him behind his mother than I can understand the taking away of his mystery. The movement has all grown out of a materialized philosophy. All that does not square with this philosophy they cut out and cast aside.

In life many events are interlinked. Our attention has been called to certain pieces of Sunday school literature, in which evidently the author was trying to explain Biblical incidents without admitting or giving any large place to the presence of the supernatural. His head was too thick for the idea to have full room that a religion that did not embrace the supernatural would be utterly worthless and futile, having no more power than any human philosophy or foolish worldly system of thought. As an instance, one writer would escape the miracle of the floating ax by referring to the fact that the ax was taught to swim. In other words, he would perform two miracles to get rid of one; in the last case he not only had the ax to swim, but he had first taught it to perform this feat.

Yes, we have a few who say, "We simply can't believe in this utter disaster that came upon the world—in the Fall, the Flood, the Ransom paid to the Powers of Evil, and the propitiation of God's just wrath." And it is

this class, together with the irreverent, the indifferent, and the unconcerned, that makes it difficult to supply the proper influences for the growing youth of to-day.

Arthur Nash has said:

> Men there are, of whom I have met thousands, who are making their way through life untroubled by a single problem or question relating to spiritual things, or with anything relating to creed or belief. Not vicious men, these, not notoriously evil. On the contrary, many are to be reckoned as being among the most respectable and respected members of society. Such matters as these simply have no place in their scheme of things—that is all. Born in homes where no attention or significance was given to the things of the spirit, reared in an environment where personal religion played no part, they have grown to maturity completely insensible to the appeal of anything which does not relate immediately to sense and time. With such men, ignorance is indeed "bliss, or at least freedom from "The gnawing worm."[13]

So it appears that we are developing in our age a sort of soulless type. The absence of any religious reaction, growing out of the fact that no inculcation of moral and religious ideas has ever been attempted, is a tragedy unspeakable. Yet this is exactly what the author teaches. Perhaps no better evidence of early moral and religious training could be given than that which occurs in the case of Nash himself. Brought up as a Seventh-Day Adventist, and a preacher in this Church for a time, he at least had the benefits of a full knowledge of the Holy Bible. For whatever may be the demerits of his church, if we are to accept his statements regarding it, though he no longer is a member of it, we must admit that it is better than nothing. Indeed, may we not assume that anything, however imperfect, that gives some religious content, and gives some foundation upon which soul action can be secured, has some value in

[13] Nash, "The Golden Rule in Business," pp. 34-35.

fact. He was dismissed from the ministry of his church because he would not hold to certain of its narrow views, but he never got beyond the call of his God, which in after years was to result in the most phenominal business undertaking ever recorded in the history of industry in America, and all in keeping with the Golden Rule of God. He even states that the Adventists avoided the public schools because the Bible was not taught. Let us hear what he says:

> Holding to the beliefs they do, it is not surprising to find that Seventh-Day Adventists regard it as being contrary to their principles to send their children to the public schools. In this, as in other matters, they exhibit a spirit of unbending consistency. I have personal knowledge of little groups of Adventists, dotted up and down the country, so poor as to be just about touching the poverty line, who, in some way or other, contrive to raise money to maintain what they describe as a church school—a school in which there are gospel-readers, gospel-spellers, gospel-arithmetics; where anything approaching what other people would regard as an ordinary manual of physical geography is not used, because it is looked upon as teaching infidelity. Yet knowledge of the Bible (of its literal text, I mean) among the Adventists is simply extraordinary. I have no hesitancy in stating that no body of Christians to be found anywhere in the whole wide world can even begin to compare with them in this respect. Even the young children are more familiar with the Holy Scripture than most grown-ups of other sects. I have known more than one youngster, of twelve years or so, who could have put the majority of preachers I have ever been privileged to meet, to complete confusion in a knowledge of the contents of the Bible.[14]

Now we are not recommending that any one should join the Seventh-Day Adventists; neither do we think it necessary for the school system in America to become quite as much insulated from the things that are reli-

[14] "The Golden Rule in Business," pp. 24-25.

gious and vital and from the word of God itself as we have reason to fear is the case.

Just here we desire to quote from Dr. W. P. Few, the President of Trinity College,[15] North Carolina, not because what he says may be interpreted as applying exclusively to the institutions of the Church, but for the reason that the truth in what he says is applicable to all. Moreover, if what he says is true, and the institutions not of the Church should fail to meet the needs of this hour, then the burden of responsibility would necessarily largely, if not entirely, fall upon the Church. Society must be saved; the Church must take its part in this work; the home and the school system of the State ought to be glad of the opportunity to contribute their part. This is what he says in reference to "A Dangerous Dualism":

> It is all the more necessary for religion and education to work together, because just as it has been difficult for our race to develop a harmonious civilization whose culture comes from one source and whose religion comes from another, so in education also there is a corresponding dualism and conflict. Education in Western civilization arose out of Christian origins; the school is organically a develop- from the monastery. But at the Renaissance pagan literature and pagan ideals became the subject matter of education; and the merging of these two divergent elements into one harmonious whole was beyond the power of synthesis of the earlier ages, and is still beyond the synthetic power of American civilization.
>
> And so it has come to pass here in America that we have the all too common spectacle of a great big pagan university with a little Christian annex, in the shape of a Y.M.C.A., and we have built up a vast system of public education that is in theory, and, I fear, sometimes in practice, completely divorced from all moral or religious intention.
>
> In this whole situation beyond question lies one of the gravest dangers to American civilization.

[15] Now Duke University.

> In place of this state of things we need a religion of all life and an education that seeks to develop all the faculties of men; and in the present state of human development the Church alone, and the Church at its best, can be expected to provide this sort of education.[16]

Dr. Walter S. Athearn has declared: "We have made the discovery that unless children are taught religion they will not be religious. We have also made the discovery that children can be scientifically taught religion so that the course of their entire lives is changed. Our tests prove this beyond any scientific doubt."

Yet in the face of this statement we have an article in *Good Housekeeping* for the month of February, 1924, by William G. Shepherd, a journalist and an author, who had written another article in the December number, 1923, on "We Don't Want Spiritual Illiteracy for Our Children." He calls attention to the fact that half of the twenty-five million school children in the United States are prevented by law, or regulations, or customs, from hearing the Bible read in the schools. "Sectarianism has caught us in its snare and we are afraid to let God come into the schoolroom unless he wears our particular cloak," or so thinks the author of the introduction to the article by Mr. Shepherd. At any rate, Mr. Shepherd asks the question, "What kind of children do our religionless public schools turn out?"

He attempts to answer his question, as will be indicated by excerpts taken from the article of February, 1924:

> "Dad, that religion of Osiris was a great thing, wasn't it?"
>
> Dad looked up from the evening paper—this is a true story—and said: "Where did you hear about the religion of Osiris? I never heard of it."
>
> "Why, in school," answered the son. "It was

[16] *Christian Education Monthly*, M. E. Church, South, January, 1922, pp. 4-5.

the greatest religion the world ever knew. It saved the Egyptians from barbarism, and that saved the world."

"What about our religion in America?" asked the father.

"Oh, we haven't had anything about that in school," Johnny answered.

"I'll never be able to catch up with what they teach the kids in school these days," Dad complained helplessly to mother after Johnny had gone to bed.

"Mohammedanism was the greatest religion the world ever saw," a Girl Scout of high school years told her Chief Scout one day. "Our religion in America never did what Mohammedanism did."

"Well, what did Mohammedanism do?" asked the wise Chief Scout.

"We've been studying that subject in school," said the high-school girl. "There was a time when the Moors tried to overrun the world. Almost the only culture there was in the world then was in the Mohammedans. They turned back the Moors in some terrible fighting, forced their own religion upon them, and saved mankind from barbarism."

"Do you know how the Mohammedan bible looks on women?" asked the Chief Scout.

"Well, no, I don't," admitted the Scout.

"It looks on them as animals," was the answer.

"And do you know how the teachings of our Bible raised women to the level of human beings?" asked the Chief.

"Well, of course, we didn't go into that part of it in school," answered the girl.

I tell these two stories to show this fact: The more efficient our public school system becomes in America—and it is growing amazingly in efficiency—the further it is taking our children away from morals and religion.

Our fathers studied the "three R's"; there was nothing in reading, writing, and arithmetic to cause them to ignore or neglect or question religion and the Bible.[17]

Speaking further with reference to the conditions that he finds, he says:

[17] *Good Housekeeping*, February, 1924, "Shall we Teach Religion in School?" p. 20.

> It is sinister beyond description. It shows a condition of thought and mind in the boy and girl life of our nation that explains not only all our puzzlement as to the behavior of our children, but our amazement at the growth of crime of every sort in the United States.[18]

Speaking of the tests to which he calls attention, he says:

> They show more than this, that under temptation over half of them will act dishonorably or dishonestly. To put it plainly, science shows that over half of them will cheat, and lie and steal. . . . The laboratory of science took the children in and tested them morally, and the bigger fact remains that American school children were not able to stand the strain.

Some of the tests given, together with the conclusions, are here seen:

> One of these tests was known as the "True-False" test. It has been applied to thousands of children in the United States. This test consists of presenting to the examinee a series of printed statements. After each statement are the words, in big capital letters, "TRUE FALSE." The child is asked to underline the word which he believes describes the truth or falsity of the statement. Here's a sample line from the test sheet:
>
> It is my duty to help those who are the victims of injustice. TRUE FALSE.[19]
>
> "It is NOT wrong to steal from one who has secured his wealth dishonestly."
>
> "It is more honorable to have charge of an office than to work at a trade."
>
> "Stupidity is more sinful than deceit."
>
> "Unnecessarily failing to meet an appointment on time is NOT immoral and unchristian."
>
> "It is true that our duty is greater to secure justice for the people of our own race and religion than for others."
>
> "Cheating a railroad is NOT so much a sin as cheating a person."
>
> "It is not the pupil's duty to call attention to

[18] *Good Housekeeping*, February, 1924, p. 21.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

the fact that a teacher has given him too high marks.''

''It is true that IF A STOREKEEPER GIVES YOU TOO MUCH MONEY IT IS ALL RIGHT TO KEEP IT, BECAUSE HE WOULD PROBABLY DO THE SAME IF YOU PAID HIM TOO MUCH.''

Thousands of American children assented to these statements when they had an equal opportunity to dissent from them; it was only a question of making a mark with a lead pencil. Nothing they had received in school or at home in the way of religious instruction caused them to mark their paper otherwise.

Their answers to these questions disclosed their outlook on life. They afforded proof that under American life, away down deep into its very childhood, there is unmorality in thought and downright approval of dishonesty.

Belief in dishonesty is one thing; acting dishonestly is another. These children, situated in different parts of the United States, coming from different stations in society, different kinds of homes and different environments, have been tested, coldly, as scientists test everything that comes to their hand, for their honesty—and they have failed.[20]

In the test in which storekeepers and clerks have been taken into the confidence of the experimenters, when children were sent to purchase articles with the standard price of twenty-five cents, and given money of that amount to purchase same, and then were given a rebate of ten cents by the merchant, the article says:

The test was to see how many children—and which ones—would bring back the dime to the teacher.

Sixty-four per cent of the children did not return the dime, either to the teacher or to the store.

The scientists who made this test insist that their selection of children was made so carefully that they feel safe in assuming that sixty-four per cent of all America's children would have done as these did.[21]

[20] *Good Housekeeping*, February, 1924, by Shepherd, p. 172.
[21] *Ibid.*

Moreover, the school children gave a banquet to a restaurant keeper, who had shortly before made a present to the school organization. During the banquet, the children having previously been furnished a certain amount of money to pay their individual expenses, it was announced that the cost was less than had been anticipated and therefore they would hand in a lesser amount. While the children were supposed to return the difference to the school organization, only a small percentage of them did so. It is fair to say that the writer has little sympathy with such severe tests being imposed upon childhood. However, as they were imposed, and as the character-sifting process revealed a calamitous situation, he passes on the facts.

Inasmuch as those who stood the character tests the best were in those groups that had had what are regarded as the best advantages in order to develop morals and strengthen character, we give the scores as given by the author of the article and as taken from the book by Dr. Walter S. Athearn, "Measurements and Standards in Religious Education":

Rank	Group	Average in Tests
First	Camp Fire Girls (four months)	62.2
Second	Boy Scouts (two years)	82.3
Third	Boy Scouts (six months)	80.4
Fourth	Private School	78.2
Fifth	Private School	75.0
Sixth	Boy Scouts (just organized)	60.5
Seventh	Private School	59.5
Eighth	Boy Scouts (just organized)	58.1
Ninth	Public School	56.8 [22]

It will be noted that the lowest percentage was represented in the public school group, not identified with the Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, etc.

In the Indiana Survey we are told that more than twenty thousand Sunday school children and over two

[22] *Good Housekeeping*, February, 1924, p. 175.

thousand Sunday-school teachers were interviewed. Regarding this, the writer says:

> Dean Athearn told me this: "Indiana is not any worse than any other state in the Union. It may be a little better, for all I know. But 1,734,137 persons in Indiana, or 62.2 per cent of the population, are not identified with any Church, either Jewish, Protestant, or Catholic, and 551,590 children and youth are not identified with the educational program of any Church. Half of the Protestant children of Indiana attend Sunday school; half of those who do go are absent half the time. Half of every Sunday school session is given over to opening and closing exercises, instead of lessons. The result is that the Indiana children who do go to Sunday school receive a total of TWELVE HOURS OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION ANNUALLY."[28]

Of course, the failure of the Sunday school, whether from inefficient teachers, poor attendance, short time for teaching, and improper Sunday school literature, cannot be charged up as a part of the failure of the public school system. Yet in so far as any of these items are true, it means that unless the public school system steps in, all of the work will be ignored. Moreover, the class of teaching and the attitude of the teachers in the Sunday school is largely a product of the preparation of the schools of yesterday. Then, too, many of the students who attend the Sunday schools, or do not attend, are registered in the week-day schools.

But what we especially desire is to be assured that the education provided by the State is developing good citizens. In view of the moral tests indicated above, and in view of the social, political, and domestic corruption which characterizes the times, the matter of secularized education demands a careful scrutiny. It appears that means have not been employed of sufficient

[28] *Good Housekeeping*, February, 1924, by Shepherd, pp. 175-176.

effectiveness to secure the moral soundness required.

To examine further the product of the schools (and we may assume that most of those guilty of crime have had more or less of experience in the public schools at least), Mr. Shepherd tells us that he has secured figures from William B. Joyce, Chairman of the National Surety Company, of New York, showing the estimated thefts that will occur in the United States for this year, and they are as follows:

Nature of Crime	Amount Stolen
Stock Frauds	$1,000,000,000
Credit Frauds	400,000,000
Burglary, Larceny and Petty Theft	250,000,000
Embezzlement	100,000,000
Forgery	100,000,000
Seaport Robberies, Piracies, Customs Frauds	100,000,000
Railroad Freight Thefts	25,000,000
Home-Building Frauds	25,000,000
	$2,000,000,000
Add Miscellaneous Financial Crimes	1,000,000,000
Total	$3,000,000,000 [24]

But this is not all. As great as are the estimated thefts for 1924, we find that burglary and embezzlement, according to the above writer, have been steadily increasing through more than a decade. The figures are quoted here from 1910 to 1921 inclusive:

Year	Embezzlement Losses	Burglary Losses
1910	$1,396,081	$ 886,045
1913	2,030,201	1,298,588
1918	3,060,348	2,964,790
1919	4,633,604	5,660,305
1920	5,623,819	10,189,853
1921	8,270,000	11,500,000 [25]

[24] *The Literary Digest*, March 15, 1924, pp. 31-32.
[25] *Good Housekeeping*, February, 1924.

Take these facts given above along with the further statement made by Mr. Shepherd to the effect that "fifteen thousand persons will die this year by murder and homicide in our country. It would take three hours for a procession of those who will perish by murder or homicide before December 31, 1924, to pass a given point."

The *Literary Digest* for March 15, 1924, has deemed the article by Mr. Shepherd as worthy of being quoted in sections, and commented upon, through its columns. But the *Digest* itself, in introducing its remarks in reference to the article, makes a statement which brings that periodical on the witness stand to give testimony on the matter under discussion. We quote from the introductory remarks of the editor of the *Digest* as follows:

> A revealing light is cast upon the cause of the shady morals in public life, now being dragged out into view, by a magazine article that exposes the beginnings of financial and moral laxity in our school children. Written long before Teapot Dome became a byword, it appears at the very moment to show where the root of adult crookedness begins and where it should be attacked. In school, it seems, every pagan god in history may be the subject of the day's lesson, but not the God of the Bible. A knowledge of Greek and Roman gods is often one of the requirements in courses necessary for graduation. Geography is taught along with the history of pagan faiths, but the God with whose handiwork geography is concerned, the God of Christianity and of Judaism, is left out of the curriculum. The child must learn about Him and about religion as best he can. The comparatively few children who go to Sunday school, as shown in statistics compiled in Indiana, average twelve hours a year in religious training; some, of course, receive additional training in the way they should go at their mothers' knees, but a vast number receive it not at all. It seems that it is not the business of the public school to teach the child the plain and simple morals of everyday living, to teach him that it is as sinful to

> cheat a storekeeper or a railroad company as a friend, as sinful to steal from the rich as from the poor. The result is seen in the archives which we would the soonest forget, in the unparalleled growth of crime of every sort in the United States.

But editors, preachers, journalists and educators are not the only ones that are now interested in the vast number of crimes that curse our country to-day. The *Youth's Companion* of October 11, 1923, under the heading, "Crime and the Courts," tells of the meeting of this American Bar Association in Minneapolis, and of its discussion of the frequency of the violations of laws. It calls attention to the fact that in 1921 there were 9,500 homicides in this country; whereas in England and Wales, with a population of more than a third of ours, there were only sixty-three. It was also noted that whereas New York had 260 murders in that year, London only had 17.

But taking the record as we find it, take the daily papers as authentic sources of news in reporting the events of the day, take such scenes as the "Fatty Arbuckle Party" in San Francisco, together with the revolting forms of crime that are being brought to our attention daily, we are obliged to conclude that the secularization of the schools in America has failed to bring into a high degree of efficiency the character of citizenry that the State and the nation must have. Without insinuating that there has been the least effort in this system of education to discount religious values, we are forced to think that Christ and his principles have not been given the central place in the system which both religion and patriotism demand. Certain it is, any system of education that does not result in the development of moral principles, which is the first essential for the perpetuity of the State itself, is manifestly inadequate.

It is true that a part of the failure to produce the

right sort of citizens may be ascribed not wholly to the system of education, but to other reasons. For instance, in the Research Bulletin of the National Educational Association for September, 1923, on page 264, we learn that fifty-four per cent of the nation's teachers have had less training than the graduation from normal school or its equivalent; that one teacher in four in the country has had less than two years' training beyond elementary school graduation, and that thousands are graduates of elementary schools and nothing more, and that thirty-six per cent of the rural teachers of the nation have had less than two years' teaching experience. Whether there is any connection between the secularization of the schools and the fact that out of every one thousand entering school only three hundred enter the high school, and only fourteen remain to graduate, is a matter for consideration. The relation of morale to morals and of endurance to religion, affords suggested lines of inquiry.

Are we getting results? That there are many very fine boys and girls in the schools and colleges, none will deny. That there are some most excellent refined gentlemen and women teaching in the colleges and in the high schools conducted by the State is freely admitted. That particularly in the South there is very little room for the raising of questions of unorthodoxy, yet are we getting results? A college president recently spoke of a college community as being one of the safest places for a young man. Possibly he was right. He referred to the very excellent young life of to-day. With a gesture he waved away the crime records, and doubtless would have turned a deaf ear to any of the statements made in this chapter. At least his manner would suggest as much. But what are we going to do with the criminal record? Are the judges proclaiming falsehoods from the bench when they call attention to facts

that have been published? Do the investigations being raised in Congress mean that the highest deliberative body in America is acting under hallucinations? Are all the editors crazy? Are the headlines in the daily press false? Do our own eyes deceive us when we see the Lord's day desecrated on every hand? Are we getting the results?

It is admitted that in one chapter we can only approach certain phases of the big question as to the merit of the secularization of the schools in this country. We cannot lay at the door of this fact all of the crime. Possibly America, as intimated in a former chapter, had become secularized first, and then secularized her schools. But the school, the home, and the Church must shoulder the larger part of the responsibility for the moral conditions of to-day. Whether we shall divide the responsibility equally among the three institutions, or change the proportions in any given case, is another matter.

It is the more necessary to discuss these matters, for the reason that we have reached a time when probably we had as well recognize that the State will continue in the field of education more and more as the years go by, in order to take care of the education of the poor; and as poverty increases among the masses, probably the need will be even greater. Moreover, as the centralization of government continues to increase, and as it becomes more paternal in form, there will be more national authority and larger revenues through taxation to carry on the work. We must see to it that those aspects of education which contribute the most important part in the life of the individual citizen, the moral qualities, shall not be neglected. Furthermore, we need to dispel that illusion that a sound morality can be generally expected without a deep religious principle behind it to support it. Neither may we expect this

principle without proper religious instruction and training to implant it.

To approach it from this angle is both patriotic as well as religious. The lives of empires have varied in their duration. Florence was a republic for thirteen hundred years; Venice for eleven hundred; Carthage for seven hundred; Rome for five hundred; yet the German Empire existed hardly the space of a lifetime. The question now is, how long will the United States of America endure? In solving the matter of a right system of education, we may determine the durability of our republic.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATION REDEFINED

EDUCATION is too frequently confounded with learning. To be sure, in the processes of education learning will be acquired; but knowledge is neither the end nor the highest objective. Too long the emphasis has been placed upon increasing knowledge, rather than in developing character. There is an education in vice as well as in righteousness and in justice. Men reflect very largely that which they learn. Moreover, good knowledge is a great blessing, and evil knowledge is a great curse. To make education an inclusive term, to take in all that has been acquired, and then to say that it is good, may be to fly directly in the face of truth.

Man is many-sided in his nature. He has a mind that must be trained and cultivated. He has a spiritual nature that needs development. His moral life should find expression and exercise. If the individual is to be properly prepared for the duties of life, he must be nurtured in his entirety. Personality is the blending of the unification of all these elements that enter into the individual; or, perhaps, to be more logical, personality precedes them all, and they are but expressions of it. However, in either case they need to be fully and rightly developed and exercised.

The greatest benefactors of mankind have almost invariably been educated men; but with few exceptions, if any, they were not only educated in mind, but enriched in heart as well. Moses was educated in all of the learning of the Egyptians; but had Egyptian learning

been the limit of his culture he would never have been the deliverer of Israel nor the lawgiver to the nations of earth. His education was not completed in the universities of Egypt, but in the wilderness places, minding the flocks of his father-in-law while he gave attention to meditation and to communion with his Maker. Strictly speaking, education never ends, and he received not his parchment until on lonely Nebo's heights God buried him with his own hand.

But to assume that every highly educated person is also a benefactor, will not hold. That is, if the education consists in the mastering solely of those books that sharpen the wits and make more logical the processes of the mind, then the individual is still lopsided and inefficient. Moreover, we are to regard the mastery of knowledge as the taking hold of the instruments which we are to use. The use to which these instruments are to be put depends entirely upon the individual. The training of the individual, not only as to outlook, but also as to feeling and to motive, is equally important. Indeed, sublime motives, with great mental limitations, will achieve much, whereas great mental enrichment, without burning aspirations, will prove futile.

It may be assumed that there is a general admission of the fivefold activities of life as laid down by Herbert Spencer:

> 1. Those activities which directly minister to self-preservation. 2. Those activities which, by securing the necessaries of life, indirectly minister to self-preservation. 3. Those activities which have for their end the rearing and discipline of offspring. 4. Those activities which are involved in the maintenance of proper social and political relations. 5. Those miscellaneous activities which make up the leisure part of life, devoted to the gratification of the tastes and feelings.[1]

[1] "Education," pp. 13-14.

This of course would indicate that any sort of education would at least include items to cover the activities named above, though it does not follow that this program should limit the field of educators' endeavor. Spencer sounded a higher note when he said:

> Sad, indeed, is it to see how men occupy themselves with trivialities, and are indifferent to the grandest phenomena—care not to understand the architecture of the heavens, but are deeply interested in some contemptible controversy about the intrigues of Mary Queen of Scots!—are learnedly critical over a Greek ode, and pass by without a glance that grand epic written by the finger of God upon the strata of the Earth! [2]

Certain it is that education has been subject to review in the conception that people hold concerning it during all the past. It is still a matter largely of experiment. No one knows this better than Spencer himself. He says:

> Had there been no teaching but such as is given in our public schools, England would now be what it was in feudal times. [3]

No doubt many of the views entertained by Spencer have assisted in the progress in the field of education since his time. He did perceive that the object of education was to include such matters as how to take care of the body, treat the mind, bring up a family, behave as a citizen. Or, as he says:

> To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging of any educational course is, to judge in what degree it discharges such function. [4]

Moreover, he understood that the acquirement of every

[2] "Education," p. 73.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

kind of knowledge has two values—"value as *knowledge* and value as *discipline.*"[5]

We are not convinced that a purely utilitarian idea of education is wise. There is a training in the development of the will in enduring mental drudgery, which may have no higher purpose than to train the mind, develop the memory, and strengthen the character. For instance, it has been said:

> Teachers used to have, and ignorant people still have, a pretty theory that we ought to learn pieces of poetry in order to cultivate the memory. This venerable, this ludicrous fallacy has been long exploded, yet our teachers continue to make their pupils learn poetry, and codes and programmes wisely require a certain amount of repetition every year from each child who studies English. There is this important difference. The point of view is entirely changed. Pupils learn poetry now not for the sake of the memory, but for the sake of the poetry.[6]

While it is freely granted that it is easier to learn poetry when there is a desire to do so, or when the sentiment of the poem inspires the love for it, yet it may be necessary to force the training of the memory by not only learning poetry, but many other unpleasant subjects, if such subjects should be unpleasant to the children, for the sake of the memory itself. The will must be exercised and the mind must be trained. There is no discipline but that may be irksome at times. It is a part of education to acquire the ability to overcome that which is itself irksome. Only the parasitic world adopts the policy of seeking and finding the way of least resistance. The imperial spirit of man grows more powerful by meeting and overcoming the unpleasant tasks of life which his higher judgment may dictate should be vanquished.

[5] "Education," p. 19.
[6] Adams, "Herbartian Psychology Applied to Education," p. 134.

Assuming that the first step in education is to train the mind, our efforts should be addressed to this one object. Whatever studies will best harness the mental faculties should be undertaken. The memory being a part of mind, and the storehouse of the mind's information, it must of necessity be early engaged and taught to submit to infinite detail and drudgery. But as memory is not the only faculty, the reasoning power must be occupied by such subjects as will require the exercise of reason. Likewise, the absence of any talent for music may suggest the greater importance of giving some attention to rescuing what may be a well-nigh lost faculty.

Training the mind has a larger significance than the immediate knowledge gained or even the amount that is stored up in memory. No athlete can bear the strain in the final tests unless he has gone through a rigid discipline in training for many years previous to the test. No doubt the explanation for many of the breakdowns in life is to be found in the want of thorough and continued training during the earlier years. The mind must become "seasoned," so to speak, to bear constant and heavy responsibilities. It must become toughened by past endurance until the strains of the present make little impression upon it.

This is but the beginning, however, of education, for in addition to training the mind, it must be furnished with a variety of information that every cultured individual is expected to have. There should be knowledge of the native tongue, familiarity with all of the modern sciences, a respectable acquaintance with history in general. Then, there should also be a knowledge of the matters with which we have to do every day. For instance, a woman should have some knowledge of the value of foods, and be able to arrange a menu that would furnish the proper ingredients not only for sustaining life, but to keep it at the maximum of its ef-

fectiveness. It may be all right for her to be able to do fancywork and play a piano; but it will be a thousand times more important for the well-being of her home if she should happen to have a knowledge of how to handle a baby and to provide a nutritious table at the minimum cost. How many suicides and embezzlements occur annually because of the wrong education of women, society can never know.

Every boy that misses a year behind the plow handles has failed to have one of the most enriching experiences in life. This is the sort of education that develops the will power to work, and gives the physical endurance that makes it possible. Moreover, the knowledge gained of plant life and this close experience up against nature, and in contact with animal life as well, will prove one of the fertile chapters of all the educational processes.

If it is well to know how to bathe and feed a baby and how to point out the location of the various constellations in the heavens, it certainly ought to be most valuable of all to know something about Him who paints the baby's smile and drapes the sky with azure and festoons it with stars amidst the shadows of the nighttime. Education can be made practical and effective while training the mind.

Many educators hold to the position that it does not matter so much what one learns, as it is not the *what,* but the *how,* which matters most. Or shall we raise the Herbartian question? Do any of them train the mind at all; can the mind be trained? In discussing Formal Education, Adams, in his "Herbartian Psychology Applied to Education," points out the fact that it is difficult to submit to any three men a puzzle but that one of the three would find an easier approach to its solution, assuming that they had been educated respectively in the three different ways—the classics, science, mathematics. That is to say, there would be a special

preparation better fitting one of the three for this particular task throughout life. As he would indicate, it is difficult to find a man brilliant in mathematics who is a dolt at everything else. If the Spartans found it convenient to teach larceny, not as a branch of culture, but for a utilitarian reason, then why should not we resort to teaching religious ethics, morality, and religion, for the good of society and for the spiritual welfare of the people?

If we admit, as Herbert Spencer does admit, the value of that knowledge which indirectly aids self-preservation by facilitating the gaining of a livelihood, how much more readily should we respond in our affirmation of such courses of study as would insure our spiritual safety against the contingencies of eternity, to say nothing of the moral perils in our present social order.[7]

Unless Herbert Spencer meant to include the religious life under Item 5, in his fivefold activities of life, then we should include it in our scheme as Item 6. For while we are quite ready to agree with him that those activities which minister to self-preservation, and also those that indirectly minister to self-preservation, as well as those which have for their end the rearing and disciplining of offspring, together with those involved in the maintenance of proper social and political relations, and likewise the miscellaneous activities which make up the leisure part of life devoted to the gratification of taste and feelings, nevertheless we wish to insure immortal interests a place in the objectives of culture.

We should assume, then, that any definition of education, to be exact and proper, and to fit the needs of man, and to be pertinent to his position in the universe, must of necessity cover a domain of thought wide

[7] "Education," p. 13-14.

enough to embrace all of the foregoing activities and interests. So much, then, for the content of the studies to be employed in training the mind. This does not, of course, preclude the studying of other subjects lying outside of this circle, provided the needs of these direct interests have first been met.

In achieving this objective, pictures, objects, books, and lectures, can all be employed. Moreover, the arrangement of the materials of knowledge can be presented in an orderly, logical, systematic manner, and should be. But knowledge is not the only thing involved in education.

Strange to say, we seek to impart knowledge when our object is the development of the personality. Knowledge is said to be power, but the mere possession of knowledge, without its being associated with a strong personality, is futile. The knowledge that a man has may be great, but the man himself is, or should be, greater than all that he knows. Hence, in education, while we are to give emphasis to the subject matter taught, and its fitness for producing certain corresponding results in the development of the individual, in all of these reactions we are to keep clearly before us the ultimate, highest personal development of the individual himself.

This is important because, in the last analysis, the personality of the individual will determine the use to which the knowledge would be put. With this in mind, no interpretation of the educational process which belittles the courses of study that will ennoble and elevate personality, and thereby release those mystic powers which shall at last combine, organize, and utilize all the knowledge given, is adequate.

For instance, there are certain studies which to some extent are morally colorless. Take mathematics, for for instance. It deals with figures. True, it may

develop a certain moral characteristic on the part of the student, in so far as it cultivates a love for the truth in the desire for a pure and unqualified answer to any given problem. Likewise, the study of mathematics can develop patience, will power, and perseverance, which training may be made to have a moral value under a religious impulse.

Likewise, many of the artistic, cultural courses, like music, architecture, and art, while they bring out the larger conceptions of the sublime and beautiful, need not touch the character in its relation to right and wrong, nor do they necessarily inspire one to the performance of duty.

Even religious education, if pursued simply as a science, and limited by its informative contribution, may prove futile unless the spirit of religion itself pervades in a striking way the courses offered, or unless it is incarnated in the character of the teacher who is the translator of the printed page. Success in this line as well as in any other subject lies altogether with the teacher.

Griggs, in "Moral Education," emphasizes the necessity for action and environment in moral education. Yet he agrees that these influences need to be reinforced by ethical instruction. This instruction should serve two aims:

> 1. To awaken consciousness of life and its problems, and develop an organic view of the laws of life. 2. To rationalize habits already formed and give independent guidance and control of them. In other words, ethical instruction aims to furnish the individual a definite body of knowledge and ideas, and to organize this into life and make it fruitful in conduct. It will be noted that it is the second aim which justifies the first. To give a body of ethical knowledge that is not made effective in life may be worse than useless, since it leads to a fatal divorce between thought and action. To go on reasoning ethically without living morally is as fatal

> as to receive continual emotional stimulus without expressing it in vigorous action; the result in both cases is dissipation of the moral energies and deterioration of character. Thus the element of ethical instruction is distinctly subordinate to moral living and must be made to serve directly the latter.[8]

Without assuming to understand the psychology of growth better than Mr. Griggs, nevertheless we are of the opinion that he does not give enough value to the actual contribution of ethical ideas to growth. For instance, laws are frequently made in advance of the sentiment of the great multitude. They become in a sense the teachers of and the makers of public opinion. There can be no doubt that the pronouncement of the decalogue went a long way toward changing the attitude of the people inasmuch as it gave to them a standard by which they could measure their conduct. The wise must always be the debtor to the unwise; the learned to the unlearned. It therefore becomes the duty of those who know to teach those who do not know. If there is no advantage in this, then a monstrous crime has been committed against society in recent years in the public talks given in high schools and in the army along the line of eugenics and purity of life and conduct. A fatal pedagogic mistake has been made if these thoughts are to be promulgated only after temperance and virtue have first been established.

Perhaps one of the most firmly established facts of psychology is the important place that personality plays in the development of the mind and in its attitude and exercise. Of course it is well to remember that psychology is no more stable than education itself, so far as fixed opinions are concerned. In a State University the professor of psychology, who is a doctor of philosophy, said to the writer not many months ago that anything taught in psychology further back than eight

[8] Griggs, "Moral Education," pp. 207-208.

years ago was inadequate as a foundation for its present study. Whether he meant for this deadly parallel to be called in the case of our views upon education or not does not appear. Nevertheless, in so far as there is anything settled in the realm of psychology, or as for that matter in the realm of education, the predominant fact of the importance of personality is thus far admitted.

This being so, then any scheme of education must take into consideration those studies and those environments in the school life and the character of the teachers who officiate, so as to minister to the ennoblement of personality.

An analysis of the soul, the nearest embodiment of personality, will disclose the presence of three facts incident to it. These are intellect, sensibility, will. The person, then, has the power of thinking, and naturally in his education the mind should be appealed to and exercised in order to secure its proper development. For this reason the languages, mathematics, and doubtless many subjects that have no utilitarian use may be employed to produce greater strength and capacity of pure intellect.

The person also wills, and the exercise of the will is absolutely essential to the development of character. For awhile mind may be the encyclopedia that carries knowledge, the will is to be the effective worker rightly to employ and utilize the knowledge that can be made available. For this reason those studies that involve much drudgery and that produce a feeling of pain and discomfort in their prosecution may be most effective in enabling the student to overcome the tendency to inertia. Therefore, in any course of study that is to fully develop and prepare the student for life, there should be injected studies to test and train the mettle of the student himself. In other words, one of the first tasks which the coming man must learn is to acquire the

ability to overcome the bias of his own pleasure. The will needs to be exercised by overcoming the natural reaction to pleasure or to yield to the easy way.

But the final test of education is met in the realm of sensibility and sentiment. It has long been affirmed that "sentiment rules the world." There is foundation for this. The springs of action arise in the feelings of the individual. That is why the religious system is predicated upon love. It is why Jesus wanted the young man's heart rather than his fortune. It is why education that does not reach the heart as well as the head is a failure. No doubt this truth gave rise to the proverb, "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he."

Therefore Griggs has well said:

> We cannot separate moral culture from other aspects of education, as a distinct part of the whole; but rather every phase of education has its moral import. Indeed, we may go so far as to say that the worth of any aspect of education can be estimated only as we find its relation to the development of good manhood or womanhood. Thus moral culture is the integrating center and interpretative end in all education.[9]

He also says:

> Beyond wonder and reverence, education should foster a further element in the higher religious attitude—namely, the passion for human service. While conduct that is helpful to humanity is a noble element of morality, the love that inspires such conduct is part of religion. In the same sense there is a religion of truth, a religion of art, of work, and of personal love. Thus the higher religious spirit should pervade all aspects of our conduct: life itself should become a religion.[10]

Even Herbert Spencer says:

> Sad, indeed, is it to see how men occupy themselves with trivialities, and are indifferent to the

[9] "Moral Education," p. 50.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

> grandest phenomena—care not to understand the architecture of the heavens, but are deeply interested in some contemptible controversy about the intrigues of Mary Queen of Scots!—are learnedly critical over a Greek ode, and pass by without a glance that grand epic written by the finger of God upon the strata of the earth! [11]

So it is evident that all students of the human mind and heart, whether in sacred or modern times, have realized the effect of moral and religious training. Solomon prayed for wisdom and became the wisest man in Biblical history and at the same time one of the saddest failures. His intelligence, coupled as it was with his wandering heart, produced a domestic scene as unprecedented as was the intellectual acumen that gave him his fame.

We therefore insist that in the redefinition of education, whatever else it includes, it must embrace in a more emphatic manner than hitherto the distinctive character-building idea plus the moral religious concept. Moreover, it needs to emphasize less the utilitarian objectives, in so far as they apply to business success and getting on in the world. The life is more than meat or raiment. Men can get on in the world without education, if that is their only objective. A certain Congressman recently sent over to one of the departments of the Government and asked that twelve men eminent in industry, twelve nationally known in finance, and twelve who had made greatest successes in commerce should be named, together with their educational advantages. Out of thirty-six, only six of them had attended college, and only four of these got their degrees.

The *Christian Century* is quoted in the *Literary Digest* of September 27, 1924, to the effect that a committee of seniors from Dartmouth College, appointed by

[11] "Education," p. 73.

President Hopkins to study the tendency and the objective of the modern college system, reported in part as follows:

> The serious question arises: Should the college continue to be bellhop to the world—and, in an age where the apparent criterion of any venture is the commercial touchstone, "Will it pay?" to turn out a finished product whose bugaboo is pure learning and whose idol is immediate, paying practicability? Or, on the contrary, has the college some more difficult function—to be the leader, and not the errand-boy, of society; to set up ideals for the world, and thereby satisfy a need more fundamental than those represented by the fluctuating demands of a changing society?

So it appears that the more mature students themselves have the opinion that there is something more valuable in a real education than increased ability to get money or gain worldly benefit.

The failure of our present system of education to save us from a deluge of crime is forcing educators to a reconsideration as to what is involved in the very act of education. The Columbia, S. C., *State* of October 13, 1924, carried a full account of a sermon delivered by Prof. G. Croft Williams in the Shandon Baptist Church, in that city, on the day before. Dr. Williams is Professor of Sociology at the University of South Carolina, and was formerly Secretary of the State Board of Public Welfare. After calling attention to the fact that for the last nine years the homicides in South Carolina have averaged two hundred and fourteen per year, or at the rate of one hundred and sixty eight for every million of population, as against London that has only two homicides per million, and likewise calling attention to the high rate in other cities of this country, such as New York, with forty-six, and Chicago, with sixty-eight per million, among other things he said:

> The school gets children young, and it has power to teach them to think and believe as it will. Its great function is to train them in their plastic years to fit into a social order. Many schools are doing this, but many others are not fitting children to live in this world at this time and on the highest level.
>
> Many teachers and school authorities think that when they have given their pupils a required number of credits they have educated them. So much arithmetic, so much grammar, so much geography, all properly mixed and administered, and then comes the good citizen. The only trouble with this program is that it doesn't work. The Ten Commandments need to be added to this curriculum, also some courses whereby our boys and girls will know and admire those great and generous thoughts that have been the chief adornment of our race and from whom has flowed most of the light that illuminates the ways of man. Our schools should foster thought, and not bow down to the child that perfectly mirrors his teacher. They should reward goodness as well as smartness, and hold before their children a beautiful and worthy social life, so that those children would grow to admire such a world and long to bring it about. Such schools would decrease the number of delinquents by increasing the number of worthy men and women.

Moreover, the right sort of education ought to be able to produce intensity of convictions. No argument is needed to sustain the proposition that there can be no strength of character without strong convictions, and there can be no strong convictions without clear and incisive beliefs. Dr. Mary Reddington Ely, of Vassar College, in an address before the National Association of Biblical Instructors, as reproduced in *Christian Education,* December, 1924, among other things says:

> Any agency that can be formative in producing tolerant attitudes is to be utilized; and to be creative in this enterprise is to give a divine gift to the age.

But no sooner has this been said than she asks the question, "Is harmony compatible with conviction or

dynamic with forbearance?" She is speaking on the subject, "The Biblical Teacher as Creator of Religious Harmony."

The fact is, her comments cause us to raise the question if any such harmony is desirable at all. She is very fortunate in quoting *The Nation* of November 21, under the caption, "The Languid Generation." She says:

> The writer comments on a conference held recently of editors and managers of undergraduate newspapers of Eastern women's colleges, at which the delegates discussed the policies of their respective college papers, and acknowledged that their difficulty was, as the writer stated it, that "the students were not interested in anything." "They looked in vain," said the writer, "for any breath of hot feeling, some prejudice, some clash of ideas. All they found was a languid tolerance of any idea."

The educational system may go far astray from the truth. Our Churches have become top-heavy with human devices for alleviating worldly needs. No wonder it has been recently said, "The multitude is at our gates, saying, 'Sir, we would see Jesus.' "

Let the educational experts inquire, What is education?

CHAPTER V

A REVISED CURRICULUM SUGGESTED

It is self-evident that society has not yet secured a curriculum for the schools and colleges perfectly satisfactory either to the public and patrons or to the educators themselves. The history of education is to a large extent a record of experiments with various sorts of curricula. The change from one to another has doubtless been with the hope of reaching an improvement that was felt to be needed. In the light of the constant flux in sentiment with reference to this matter, not only in the past, but even now, it is not presumption to assume that there is still room for improvement.

But why should any change be suggested? If our present educational system is adequate, and if it is producing the results that the public at large, publicists and statesmen, as well as patrons, are pleased with, then surely modification would be unwise. On the contrary, if we find grievous social errors and tendencies that are far-reaching in their effect upon the future of the nation, and even involving the Church of God itself, we have a right to demand an investigation concerning the merits of the present-day curricula which are being employed in the development of our future citizenship.

In our chapter on "The Secularization of the Schools in America" we called attention to certain facts touching the social order of to-day, which facts are not in dispute, inasmuch as they are simply matters of record. Moreover, in that chapter, a concrete case was given in the Indiana Survey, showing the failure of the

schools of that State to produce students that knew how to tell the truth and to be honest. When the records themselves show that forty-three and a fraction out of a hundred have failed to learn the lessons of honesty and truthfulness, it is clear that no lawyer is needed with a brief to give further proof to the case. Then there is the case of the questionnaire submitted to one hundred students in the State Teachers' College at Warrensburg, Mo., and to the students of six high schools in the cities of that State, to ascertain their knowledge concerning the Bible. It is recalled that the test revealed the fact that "sixteen per cent of the students neither knew where Christ was born, nor the name of his mother. Sixty per cent knew not that Peter, James, and John employed the larger confidence of Jesus. Seventy per cent did not know what to call the Sermon on the Mount. Sixty per cent did not know what Christ said about loving one's neighbor. Twelve per cent did not know the first clause of the Lord's Prayer. Sixty-five per cent did not know the Golden Rule."

What physician will continue to use the same prescription on a patient whose disease constantly progresses toward a fatal termination? One of the most skillful surgeons that the writer has ever known, in a stubborn case, resorted to a process which has been almost entirely eliminated from medical practice. We refer to the obsolete practice of bleeding the patient. A younger man or a less resourceful practitioner would have relied upon the employment of drugs, and the patient would have died. She had just suffered something like seven convulsions, and death was imminent. The resourcefulness which made this physician famous made him unwilling to stand by prescribed remedies that were achieving no results. He resurrected this discarded remedy and gave immediate relief to his patient, who is to-day, after ten years, a handsome woman of middle life.

Will our schoolmen learn anything from this lesson?

It is true that one or two instances, uncorroborated by other evidences, may not be sufficient to indicate a radical departure. But when there are many well-authenticated illustrations, and when the writers of the present day are so unanimous in their opinions that there is something wrong with the forces working for the best interests of society, and when the school is at least one of the agencies always involved, its curriculum must come in for its share of inspection and criticism. When so many of these social delinquents are so largely because of their moral imbecility, it is time to see to it that at least the moral nature of the rising generation shall have a fair degree of instruction.

True, we instantly run into the objection that when this is done the public schools and the State schools are invading the domain of the Churches. This of course grows out of the fact that it is difficult to teach religion without to some extent teaching the doctrine of some sect. Grant this. Shall the children of America be left in moral imbecility and kept in ignorance of the Bible because all the various sects go to it as the supreme standard for guidance in moral right and religion? Is there an intelligent Protestant so mean or narrow who would not prefer his child to be taught by a pious Catholic than to be left to grope his way in moral darkness untaught at all? Besides, the details of working out the application of the curriculum are questions of administration. An executive at the head of a college or school, together with his advisers, ought to be equal to this task. This writer believes in sectarianism. He also believes that parents should try to train their children in the faith of the family. At the same time, though he is a Methodist, he would much prefer that all of his children should become Baptists rather than grow up to be heathen. There is something worse than not

belonging to the Church the family has been accustomed to attend, and that is to belong to no Church at all, and then very likely not be amenable either to the law of God or the law of man. It is a fact beyond dispute that almost without exception the most law-abiding citizens and the most devoted patriots of our land are those who are ardently attached to some branch of the Christian Church.

Moreover, whose children are these that are being educated? Are they not the children of the American people? Do we not have a chaplain for the Senate and for the House of Representatives? Do not the Presidents of this republic kiss the Bible when they take the oath of office? Are not chaplains provided for our army and navy? Then by what reasonable argument shall we rob the children of the Bible in their school work and leave them untaught by chaplains or teachers in the formative years of their life? Let us be consistent and withdraw the chaplains from the army and navy, and cease to have hired clergymen to lead lawmakers in their morning devotions. Why, the American dollar bears upon its face, "In God we Trust"! Why be so squeamish about giving the little ones the light, lest perchance we might invade the sacred principle of maintaining inviolate the separation of Church and State? Indeed, where did this sacred tenet come from? It is a diluted idea born in French infidelity, hatched out in the French Revolution, and imported to this country along with a good many other notions which have been neither to our credit nor our profit?

There seems to be no hesitancy in teaching history and politics lest the children should get ideas of the political party to which their parents do not adhere. It would appear that some parents hold in more sanctity their political prejudices than they do their religious faiths. Yet notwithstanding this they interpose

no objections to the teaching of politics. Which is the more important, politics or religion? Possibly if more religion had been taught forty years ago some of our modern political scandals might have been averted.

So much, then, for the occasion of giving serious consideration to a modification of the curriculum used in our schools so as to embrace those subjects which make for morality and even religion. For, after all, if immortality is a fact and not a fiction, religion should be the chief objective of man. The Bible certainly can well have its place in accomplishing its divinely appointed mission in serving the eternal interests of the hope of the human race. It is time to leave sectarianism to take care of itself while we care for the religious life of the children. This is all the more true because the State and the schools have staggered at nothing that they desired to put across in the way of propaganda or in the way of standardizing and almost nationalizing the youth of to-day. Then why be so free with everything else and so feeble in the matter that counts for most, not only in all other things, but in those matters that lie beyond the grave?

The *Literary Digest* for December 27, 1924, presents some interesting facts under the general subject of "Homemade Thugs." Judge B. J. Humphrey is reported as having said that in his twenty years on the bench he could recall but one out of all the thousands of criminals brought before him who had had a Sunday school training. The Judge makes an appeal for religious influence in the home, pointing out that gunmen, thugs, and bootleggers are not the product of a day. He thinks they are the result of homes where there is laxity and indifference. He advises that the children should learn the Golden Rule rather than the rule of greed. Among other things he says: "The criminals of to-morrow are in our homes and schools, and on our

streets to-day, impressionable, eager to learn, looking for a hero to worship and a gang to join."

The *Digest*, itself, says:

> The parental neglect is not counterbalanced by any actual moral training in the public schools. Here, too, the "buck" is passed on. For some years, we are told, Dr. William J. Cox, rector of St. Andrew's Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, has been studying the relation between crime statistics and ethical instruction given in public schools of various American cities. In nine States, he finds, the very name of God may not be mentioned in the public schools, "but anything about any religion under the sun except Christianity is permitted to be taught." He found that in Chicago in the five years up to 1915, out of 55,000 persons below the age of sixteen who had passed through the hands of the police, fewer than one-sixth had even heard of the Ten Commandments. In a New York high school with 1,985 pupils, when a test case was given and they were told to write anything they knew at all about the Ten Commandments, only 434 were able to write anything. Several graduates of the Newark, N. J., high school informed him that they were preparing to become teachers of Socialism, and confessed that they had never heard of the Ten Commandments. As a result of the staggering conditions he encountered, Dr. Cox suggests a twentieth-century use of the Ten Commandments. It would be in the form of a pledge of allegiance to be taken by all school children. His proposal, which is said to have received the indorsement of several Catholic clergymen, Jewish rabbis, and Protestant ministers before whom it had been placed, appears thus in *The Reformed Church Messenger*:
>
> "I would have all school children taught to subscribe allegiance to *the law of right belief* underlying the First Commandment. The Second Commandment indicates the law of *the right to worship*, freely and joyously. The Third Commandment would ask a pledge for *reverence for God, for our institutions, for the law, for old age, and for holy things.* The Fourth Commandment requires a pledge *for work and for rest* as a sacred obligation, aside from its religious stipulation. The Fifth Command-

ment would ask *obedience to authority, parental and governmental.* The Sixth Commandment would require *no murder* to be done. If children could be made to realize early the seriousness of killing, we would not have 12,000 murders in the United States in one year, 55,000 suicides, 38,000 persons killed by automobiles, and hundreds of thousands killed by carelessness and injury. Children must be taught self-control. Only recently I visited a hospital and found a girl there who lay paralyzed from the waist down by the bullet from the pistol of a man who had wanted to marry her.

"The Seventh Commandment would require *a pledge for purity.* In visiting schools during recess periods I heard more foul speech from the mouths of little ones than I had ever heard anywhere else in all my life. Children should be taught purity in living, in books, in moving pictures, in marriage, and in love. The Eighth Commandment *asks for honesty.* In one year in this country $3,245,000,000 is taken by dishonest means, through defalcation, fraud, stealing, and banditry. The Ninth Commandment should emphasize *truth.* Teach a child to be truthful as well as honest and you will stop slander, lying, false representation, and bad advertising. Finally, teach *contentment,* not to the caste system, but to one's duty wherever one finds it."

That the country is even now waking up to the necessity of going back to the day school and there supplementing whatever has been done in the home and the Church, and especially to supply the instructions which may not have been given elsewhere, is seen from an extract taken from the *Christian Advocate,* the general organ of the M. E. Church, South, of October 31, 1924:

Already approximately a thousand cities, towns, and communities are providing week-day religious instruction in some organized way. One hundred and fifty thousand children are now enrolled in these classes. In hundreds of cities and communities all Protestant Churches cooperate most harmoniously in this movement, and in many places Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, together with public school authorities, are working shoulder to shoulder at the common task of providing more adequate and ef-

> ficient religious instruction for their young people.
>
> A little study of its achievements in communities where week-day Church schools have been organized shows that the worth-while results of the movement are as remarkable as its growth is rapid. The movement has passed the experimental stage, though it is still in its pioneer period. It could not have escaped the fatal disasters which follow too rapid development if it were not producing worth-while results.
>
> Two of our great boards, the General Sunday School Board and the Board of Education, are, upon the authority of the General Conference, assisting in the promotion of the movement in our own Church. When we consider that there are fifteen million children in America of school age who do not attend Sunday school or like institution and that only a small part of the fifteen million who do attend are receiving anything like adequate religious instruction, we shall begin to realize the tremendous importance of the week-day Church school as an agency for reaching the spiritually neglected children of America.

This same article refers to the fact that less than a decade ago, when widely separated communities began to make experiments in week-day religious instruction, there were many calls for information about the "North Dakota Plan," the "Colorado Plan," and the "Gary (Indiana) Plan."

It so happens that the *Homiletic Review*, just out, for January, 1925, has an article on the subject, "Can Religion Be Taught?" and with a subhead, "Cultivating the Religious Life of Public School Children," by William Grant Seaman, Ph.D., D.D., Gary Ind. It is significant that this article is written from one of the cities above referred to. Therefore, its conclusion should have more than ordinary weight. This appears doubly true because the writer, being a Ph.D. and a D.D., is presumably both a scholar and a minister. No doubt he has had unusual opportunities for seeing at first hand the experiment tried out.

Dr. Seaman, in the above article, calls attention to the fact that the Government at great expense has done a vast deal for the physical benefit of the people, especially in supplying health information which would prolong life. This, however, as he notes, increases the power and the influence of the ignorant masses, whose homes are most fruitful of children, and therefore a larger number of them will survive under the new regimen. This means that the destiny of the homeland and the kingdom of God here and abroad depends in large measure upon these. He reminds us that the public school is our opportunity to reach these children.

In answering the question, "Can Religion be Imparted?" he says:

> But can week-day instruction in connection with the public schools make religion a real power in the children's lives? Such instruction can teach literature and history, but can it impart religion—that sense of the presence of Christ and that spirit of obedience to him which are necessary to make religion a real power in their lives? Happily these questions can be answered in the affirmative.
>
> In the first place, there are certain definite religious values in having classes for religious instruction as a part of the child's week-day school program. It makes religion a natural thing rather than something so apart from everyday life as to appear to be a thing imposed on real life from outside. It also adds to the prestige of religion in the child's mind to put it into his regular work day. It will appear to him then as quite as valuable and as worthy of study as are the secular subjects.

He emphasizes, however, the importance of the teacher's personality who attempts to do this work, and in substantiation of another chapter in this book, "The Teacher and his Qualifications," he says:

> It is often said that from 70 to 80 per cent of the influence of the schoolroom lies in the personality of the teacher. Religion must be caught rather than taught; it cannot be caught anywhere

or at any time from teachers who do not have it, but it can and will be caught by public school children in week-day classes if the teachers really have it.

With reference to the curriculum, he has this to say:

The religious life of the child can also be cultivated through the curriculum. Most commonly the subject-matter taught has been the Bible. Doubtless it is possible to teach the Bible as literature or as history in such a way that its religious values will be slight or even negative. Here again it is largely a matter of the teacher's attitude. It hardly seems wise to strive to have public school teachers teach the Bible, for if the child comes away from its study feeling that it is only literature or history, there has been established in his life a mistaken attitude which may stand like a wall to shut out the religious values of the Bible when they are presented. The Bible should always be taught by persons who have experienced its religious values and who use the literature, biography, and history as the makers of the Bible did—only as a means by which God may be made real to the lives of men. The Bible thus taught has been productive of phenomenal religious values and it can be done on week days with great efficiency.

But to secure the largest religious values, the curriculum should be turned about. The real aim of the teacher should be not the teaching of anything, even the Bible, but the cultivating of the child's religious life. When that is the teacher's aim, clearly conceived and intelligently pursued, then and only then can the teaching of the Bible or anything else be made to bear its fullest fruitage in the lives of the children. With that aim before the teacher other factors will also be introduced into the curriculum. These other factors will be in part additional things to be taught, such as extra-Biblical religious hymns, biographies, and historical facts, but a large place will be made in the curriculum for specific efforts at the cultivation of Christian attitudes. The spirit of Christ will be unfolded with exactness and completeness, its manifestation under various circumstances made clear, and also how it may be secured and maintained.

Dr. Seaman is convinced that the efforts of the teacher will go a long way toward establishing Christian habits of living in the life of the child. He thinks that the public school provides a better opportunity than the Sunday school, because the meetings are more frequent and the time for teaching is longer. He cites an actual case in the schools of Gary where a director of education for one of the Churches put on a program in the schools to establish the prayer life by having the children repeat memorized prayers, and then also by having them compose prayers of their own. More was achieved in the public school than in the Sunday school. As an evidence of the effect of this work at school on a family that was not at all religious, this incident is given: "One night the father called out from the next room, 'What are the children saying?' to which the reply was: 'Shut up, you darn fool. They're saying their prayers.'"

But what is Dr. Seaman's conclusion of the matter? He says:

> The conclusion is that religion can be imparted to public school children in week-day classes. But to achieve that end everything should be built for it. The teacher should be built for it and chosen because she is so fashioned, the program of the instruction period should be built for it, the room should be built for it, the curriculum should be built for it, and must contain not only teaching, but training in attitudes of spirit and in habits in living the Jesus way.
>
> The future is in the hands of the children. The children in untold millions are not being reached either by our Protestant Christianity or by any other religion. Something must be done. These children are in the public schools, and they will come eagerly to intelligently conducted classes for religious instruction. What will the Church do about it?

Among the reasons assigned for doing this work in the public schools is the fact that there are millions of

children not reached by any Church or Sunday school whatever. Again, the class periods are longer and more frequent, and the teaching is more efficiently done. It will be observed that emphasis is given to the character of the teacher who attempts to do this work. In our chapter on "The Teacher and His Qualifications," further emphasis is given to this thought.

Just here it is well to note the fact that any sort of curriculum, without the proper teacher, will achieve nothing. The *Columbia State* of December 31, 1924, carries an editorial on "Teachers Who Can Teach." This paper refers to an address delivered by Dr. Smithey, of the University of Virginia, in which the professor declared as erroneous the accepted idea that "anybody can teach who knows the subject matter." This professor is also quoted as saying: "The day when men and women can teach a year or two to save up money to become lawyers, doctors, and ministers should be made one of past history."

This professor of secondary education takes the position that "the duty of the high school is to see that society receives the greatest possible return from those who attend—to train all the boys and girls of all the people. These require men of broad training, experience, and leadership."

The editor of the *State* comments on the foregoing as follows:

> True, but the duty of the elementary schools which prepare those boys and girls for the high schools is just as plain. For their instruction and guidance the same high degree of training, experience, and leadership is not necessary, but efficiency, aptitude, and interest are necessary. There can be no good work in the classroom by pupils unless there is interest, real interest, in his or her work by the teacher, and that interest is most unlikely when the teacher has had no "call" to teach; does not like to teach or expect to remain in the classroom a day

> longer than opportunity of escape presents itself.
>
> To expect good service from teachers who are not teachers at heart is fatuous. It is not the fault of the alleged teacher; it is the simple fact that a square peg will not fit a round hole. There is probably no profession in which it is more difficult to manufacture interest against inclination as that of teaching; nor is there one in which "interest" is more vital to success. One hears of the "gifted" teacher—who is that man or woman? Invariably the man or woman who loves to teach and would have no other vocation.

In the same issue of the *State* there is an article by Dr. Frank Crane on "A Secretary of Education." He calls attention to the fact that in the President's cabinet there is a Secretary of War, a Secretary of Agriculture, and a Secretary of nearly every other sort except a Secretary of Education. He also takes the position that the schooling of children is not simply a family matter, but is a national matter as well. While this writer would perhaps not agree with Dr. Crane in toto—that is, if he would let any law interfere with the rights of parents over the jurisdiction of their children—yet this writer is in agreement with him when he says:

> We send children (some of them) to Sunday school an hour a week to learn morals. What pitiful trifling! A child should be trained in honesty, sobriety, courage, and cleanliness every waking hour. The contention of religious sects has reduced school instruction to dry shucks. Teachers and school boards are afraid to instruct children not to lie and steal because the sects in town don't agree on the mode of baptism. The place for ethical instruction is in the day school.
>
> It is high time the American people woke up and strengthened, enlarged, deepened, widened, and exalted the meaning of education.
>
> If we could have a president and congress who for one administration of four years would hand every other business over to clerks and devote their entire time to providing for the right training and schooling of children, it would be the greatest thinkable blessing.

That the time is ripe for a revised curriculum is to be seen from almost every periodical that comes from the press. This is true even in the realm of theology and religion. The first article in the *Homiletic Review* for January, 1925, is "Theological Seminaries Return the Fire." This is really a reply to articles which appeared in a former number from old students of seminaries, pointing out the defects in their *Alma Maters* Many of these theological institutions admit and recognize that there is room for change and for improvement. However, Boston University takes the position that three things must enter into the making of a religious leader:

> First, the quality of the leader's manhood. He must have a certain kind of morale. At Boston, we believe that this should consist for the most part of open-mindedness to light and truth, combined with religious earnestness. Second, as a teacher of religion, he must know the materials of religion. These materials for the most part are Biblical, doctrinal, and historical. In spite of the outcry against dogma and doctrine, the simple fact remains that the Church does stand for a certain body of religious belief which is identified with Christianity. These materials should be mastered in some real sense by those who propose to be leaders. I do not see how we can slight the so-called "Content Courses" without sacrificing efficiency. Third, there is a well-recognized technique of religious work today, just as there is a technique for the medical profession and the legal profession, and the training schools for ministerial leadership are under an obligation to put their students in possession of this technical knowledge. Mere technique, however, can never be a substitute for thoughtfulness and spiritual insight. The problem before the theological schools is to keep some sort of proper balance between these three points of emphasis.

It is refreshing at least to find that an institution of such prestige believes that there should be some "CONTENT" in the courses given. Yet the very fact

that so many educators felt called upon to discuss the various phases of this subject indicates that the question is still open.

Perhaps the time will never come when the "CONTENT" of our courses of study will become insignificant or secondary. Neither will the time ever come when the student may find his own way by taking the line of least resistance, or when the study of the student himself, apart from the great truths to be taught, will take the place of greater importance than the lessons he is to learn. Cubberly tells us how Pestalozzi contributed something to changing the point of view in instruction from the subject matter to the child to be taught, and "the nature of instruction from formal religious doctrine, preparatory for life hereafter, to the study of the life and universe amid which man lives here." He also tells us how the distinguished teacher failed in trying to teach his own son the impractical suggestion of Rousseau. While it cannot be doubted that there may be value in studying the student, and in taking him into consideration in arranging the curriculum, it must not be forgotten that curriculums must meet the needs of the students, and not their wants nor their pleasure. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that in this work-a-day world and in this world in which the individual is related to other beings, and all human beings in turn related to a Supreme Being, the curriculum must be related to all of these facts and not to one alone.

It is therefore refreshing to turn to *Christian Education* for December, 1924, which is made up of addresses delivered at the National Association of Biblical Instructors, and there to find an address delivered by Prof. J. Gresham Machen, of the Princeton Theological Seminary, on "The Biblical Teacher and Biblical Facts." The professor is not disposed to let the im-

mature youth evolve his own theology out of his inner consciousness, nor to evolute a creed according to his own notions. He calls attention to the fact that the old-fashioned way of reading a book and hearing a lecture and storing up the information in the mind is regarded as now out of date. He takes the position that in education the facts are having a hard time. He says: "The other day I heard a noted educator give some advice to a company of college professors. 'It is a great mistake,' he said, 'to suppose that a college professor ought to teach; on the contrary, he ought simply to give the students an opportunity to learn.' "

Reminding us that the student cannot unify his world because he has not a sufficient number of facts in order to learn the method of putting them together, he tells us that the condition that prevails in general education is tenfold worse in the sphere of the Christian religion and in the sphere of the Bible. To quote him further:

> A generation or so ago this notion of letting the Bible speak for itself, or at least letting the individual Biblical writers speak for themselves, was exalted to the dignity of a principle. The principle was called "grammatico-historical exegesis." The fundamental notion of it was that the modern student should distinguish sharply between what he would have said or what he would have liked to have the Biblical writer say, and what the writer actually did say. The latter question only was regarded as forming the subject matter of exegesis.

But more particularly does Professor Machen illustrate the fallacy of the extreme Modernist in dealing with historical facts when he says:

> And then the examination gets into the sphere of history. The examiner asks me where the Declaration of Independence was adopted. That one also I think I know. "The Declaration of Independence," I say, "was adopted at Philadelphia." But again I meet with a swift rebuke. "That is the old answer

> to the question," I am told. "But," I say, "everyone knows that the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia; that stands in all the history books; do you not accept what stands in the history books?" "O yes," says my modern friend, "we accept everything that stands in the history books—hundred-per-cent Americans we are. But then, you see, we have to interpret the history books in our own way. And so of course we accept the proposition that the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia, but we interpret that to mean that it was adopted at San Francisco."[1]

The curriculum, then, should not only carry a body of content sufficient to furnish facts in reference to every subject taught, but the subject should be adequate from the standpoint of scholarship, so that when the students go into college the work there will be of a high order. The same qualifications for a curriculum for college students, especially undergraduates, should obtain as in the high school.

Charles R. Bagley, in the *Dearborn Independent* of August 30, 1924, writes on "Undergraduate Training —What is Wrong?" He starts out with the declaration:

> There is a widespread dissatisfaction in educational circles with the undergraduate work of colleges and universities. It would be extremely difficult to find a college or university instructor who would not shake his head dubiously when asked if the majority of the graduating class were trained men and women. The more progressive institutions are already introducing radical reforms, and educators throughout the country are discussing plans for giving better training to the youth of the land.

He proceeds to tell us that "our curriculum, low in comparison with that of the English or French colleges, is not the gravest defect in our system. Both of these nations do in the high school work what we complete

[1] *Christian Education,* December, 1924, p. 102.

only at the end of the sophomore year in college, and their high school graduates are very little, if any, older than ours."

Mr. Bagley insists that any sort of liberal education should give the student a background of knowledge, and train his mind to organize this knowledge so as to be able to produce new ideas of his own. He contends that we are breaking down in the last part of this requirement. For this reason he thinks that we are not training our students to think, and bases his opinion upon five years' experience in two colleges of the United States, one year in a French University, and two years at Oxford. Yet, strange to say, he says: "Only too often we develop the memory at the expense of the natural intelligence." Strange, for the reason that he has already laid down the necessity for a wide background of of knowledge. Certainly, the memory must be employed in order to secure and maintain such a background.

Perhaps he is correct with reference to the want of ability to organize his thoughts. His confession will doubtless add another point to the necessity for a revised curriculum. Let us hear what he says:

> When I entered Oxford University with the A. B. degree from an A-class American college, I found to my amazement and dismay that I was no better prepared for serious study than the high school graduates coming up from the English so-called "public schools," the great preparatory schools like Rugby. I realized then, for the first time, that my college training had not been thorough; I did not know how to think clearly or logically; and, worst of all, I did not know how to organize and use what facts I had retained from my earlier training—all these gaps in spite of the fact that I had averaged 94.8 during five years of college work back home. I possessed an enormous number of facts in bulk, but I was distressingly weak on original deductions and on well-substantiated opinions of my own. This, I realize, is a severe indictment of our undergraduate system, but it is nevertheless true for our

> average college or university. Scores of Rhodes scholars from various States in the Union could testify to similar experiences.[2]

He suggests that the poor undergraduate work being done in the colleges is due to lack of thorough training in the high school; a large percentage in increase in number of students going to college; lack of supervision in the elementary courses. Of course, the college is not responsible for the first two, or not entirely so.

Just here it might be remarked that the colleges might exercise an influence over the character of the work being done in the preparatory schools. They have determined how many units they will accept for admission, and what those units will be. It may chance that while the entrance requirements as measured by the number of units may be higher, in point of actual exercise of "gray matter" the standard may have been lowered. In the elimination of Latin as an entrance requirement, the colleges may have gone backward while appearing to be going forward. As to the timeliness of this position, a quotation from the *Spartanburg Journal* of December 11, 1924, sent out from Washington, headed "Latin Students Surpass Non-Latin Students," will tend to confirm it. This is the quotation:

> The conclusion that Latin students surpass non-Latin students in mastery of other subjects has been reached by the American Classical League and the Bureau of Education after a three-year survey of the present-day trend and value of classical studies.
>
> "This superiority," the bureau said in reporting the conclusions to-day, "seems to be due to something gained from the study of Latin rather than to greater initiative ability."
>
> Records of 10,000 candidates for college entrance in the last ten years were cited to show that Latin students fared better by about 13 per cent than non-Latin students in subjects other than Latin and Greek.

[2] *Dearborn Independent,* August 30, 1924.

Out of the centuries that have passed, there are two truths that cannot be entirely put aside. First, out of the body or content of the subject studied, there will be a residue, at least, deposited in the memory, in the life and in the character. So much, then, for specific data. Second, a curriculum that is easy defeats the very object of discipline. Those subjects that command the training of the memory, as well as call for close attention, may come under the head of drudgery, but they are a necessary part of the curriculum that is to result in culture and in character.

Much attention has been given of late to scientific tests in the hope of making a curriculum to comport with mental measurements. To say there is nothing in this would be foolish; yet at the moment it is the fad in school circles. Educators are no more exempt from epidemics of ideas than are the leaders in any other field of service. Not many years ago every individual that had a pain anywhere from the breastbone to the pelvis was hurried to the hospital for an operation for appendicitis. A little later every pale person on the streets was seized upon as being a victim of the hookworm. In between these two was a season in which every peculiar-looking person was a pellagra suspect. Now, it may happen that once more we will have to revise our measurements, or substitute something else for the attention of the moment. Moreover, it often happens that one who falls down on practically all the tests may be possessed of a rare and inexplicable judgment. Genius has never been satisfactorily defined. Neither can imbecility be properly explained. How then may we hope to gauge by undeviating standards the average man with latent and unsuspected powers along hidden lines?

But to go back a bit. It is interesting to turn to Cubberly, and see the course of study used in the city

of Providence, in the year 1800. In this course of study the Bible appears as the last item in the curriculum. In 1820 it does not appear. In 1828 it does not appear, nor at any of the subsequent dates given. It does appear that the Lancastrian schools, which were so prominent from about 1810 to 1830, did place religion in the curriculum.

But we have already noted the drift away from religious content in education in our chapter on "The Secularization of the Schools in America." Our contention now is that we may go forward by going backward. The foolish notion that nothing can be imposed upon an adolescent mind is as unpedagogical as it is untrue. Why not throw all the books of science out the window and leave the students to evolve systems of their own?

Bobbitt, in his book, "How to Make a Curriculum," names eight hundred and twenty-one distinct items of abilities, activities, and responsibilities that should enter into the making of a curriculum along ten different lines, not to count the subheads under these items. He certainly provides a wide field for reflection, but he is wise enough to tell us that "the first step in curriculum making is to decide what specific educational results are to be produced." He further explains that "the objectives should be stated in definite terms. When so stated, it is possible for educationalists to know with certainty at what they are aiming. It is also possible for parents and students to understand."

With this understanding it ought to be easy to fix the curriculum to remedy the evils of our day by providing the moral and religious culture necessary to produce good men and good women, in which case they will be, to a large extent, religious in fact, as well as religiously inclined.

We do not follow Mr. Bobbitt when he says, "Certain

attitudes, characteristics, and abilities cannot be made the objectives of public education because the community is too much divided. This is not notably true of the objectives of religious education. It is equally true of some of the objectives of civic and economic education." Are we to understand that society must wait upon the bickerings of the community and that the science of education must be helpless to meet the needs of the dying millions and to alleviate the tragedies of crime because of a small matter of this sort?

The thing for us to understand is that society has certain needs which can be met by a curriculum. It is our business to make it. As the lawyers determine largely what will go into the curriculums used in law schools, as journalists suggest the courses of study for the schools of journalism, and as physicians determine the courses of study for medical students, it will be proper and right for pedagogy to consult the minister in securing religious courses for the rising youth of America. The sooner this work is done the better for us, and the better for all of our educational processes. If religion embodies truth, and if truth is related to wisdom and culture, it need not be blacklisted from any place where culture is sought or obtained.

CHAPTER VI

THE TEACHER AND HIS QUALIFICATIONS

Having given some attention to the contribution of the Church to education in a previous chapter, and then having noted the secularization of the schools, together with certain consequences that in some degree may be attributable to this fact, it becomes now our duty to examine very carefully into the kind of person that should undertake to teach and the qualifications with which he should be endowed. If water can never rise above its source, it certainly is foolish to expect students to go beyond the standards set by their teachers. Therefore, the biggest question in education is not one of imposing and well-appointed school buildings, but a question as to the character, endowment, and capability of the teacher himself. Marble halls and steam-heated edifices do not in themselves either train or refine the mind. The heart of education is to be found in the teacher.

It is not strange that many of the great men of the past have at some time in their lives had the advantage of noble instructors. The Apostle Paul was one of the most remarkable men in the tides of time. It is not by chance that we learn that he once sat at the feet of Gamaliel. Johns Hopkins University came immediately into prominence because its first President interested himself not primarily in material equipment, but in assembling the best talent that he could find to fill the chairs of the new institution. It was men rather than endowment upon which he depended to build the reputation of the university. Graduates of the Law School of the University of Virginia take pride even

until this day in that when they were students Minor was a member of the law faculty. A university has been defined: Mark Hopkins one end of a log and a student on the other.

Going back to the centuries before Christ, we find even then an appreciation of the proper qualifications that should be found in those who undertake to teach. Isocrates (436-338 B. C.), whose teachers were Prodicus, Protagoras, and Gorgias, said:

> If all those who undertake instruction would speak the truth, nor make greater promises than they can perform, they would not be accused by the illiterate. Now, those who inconsiderately have dared to boast, have been the cause that those men seem to have reasoned better, who indulge their indolence, than such as study philosophy: for, first, who would not detest and despise those who pass their time in sophistic chicanery? who pretend, indeed, that they seek truth, but, from the beginning of their premises, labour to speak falsities; for I think it manifest to all, that the faculty for foreknowing future things is above our nature: nay, we are so far from such prudence, that Homer, who for his wisdom, has acquired the highest fame, has sometimes introduced gods in his poem, consulting about futurity; not that he knew the nature of their minds, but that he would show to us that this was one of those things which are impossible for man.[1]

Marcus Aurelius has acknowledged his indebtedness to his tutors:

> From Diognetus (my tutor), not to busy myself about trifling things, and not to give credit to what was said by miracle-workers and jugglers about incantations and the driving away of dæmons and such things; and not to breed quails (for fighting), nor to give myself up passionately to such things; and to endure freedom of speech; and to have become intimate with philosophy; and to have been a hearer, first of Bacchius, then of Tandasis and Marcianus; and to have written dialogues in my

[1] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," p. 13.

youth; and to have desired a plank bed and skin, and whatever else of the kind belongs to the Grecian discipline.

From Rusticus I received the impression that my character required improvement and discipline; and from him I learned not to be led astray to sophistic emulation, nor to writing on speculative matters, nor to delivering little hortatory orations, nor to showing myself off as a man who practices much discipline, or does benevolent acts in order to make a display; and to abstain from rhetoric, and poetry, and fine writing; and not to walk about in the house in my outdoor dress, nor to do other things of the kind.[2]

In the case of Horace he acknowledges his greatest debt to his father, who not only set him the best possible example, and diligently supervised his training, but also secured for him the best culture which Rome provided. He leaves this description of his education:

And yet, if the faults and defects of my nature are moderate ones, and with their exception my life is upright (just as if one were to censure blemishes found here and there on a handsome body), if no one can truly lay to my charge avarice, meanness, or frequenting vicious haunts, if (that I may praise myself) my life's pure and innocent, and my friends love me, I owe it all to my father; he, though not rich, for his farm was a poor one, would not send me to the school of Flavius, to which the first youths of the town, the sons of the centurions, the great men there, used to go, with their bags and slates on their left arm, taking the teacher's fee on the Ides of eight months in the year; but he had the spirit to carry me, when a boy, to Rome, there to learn the liberal arts which any knight or senator would have his own sons taught. Had any one seen my dress, and the attendant servants, so far as would be observed in a populous city, he would have thought that such expense was defrayed from an old hereditary estate. He himself was ever present, a guardian incorruptible, at all my studies.[3]

[2] Cubberly, "Readings in the History of Education," pp. 28-29.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

These testimonies, covering the period from about 400 B. C. to about 200 A. D., indicate that at that time in the history of the world men knew that there could not be proper teaching without the right kind of teachers. Has the human mind changed since then? Are we to expect to get different results when we vary from a former custom?

Coming to the early part of the nineteenth century, we have illustrated the far-reaching influence of a great teacher. It is said of Pestalozzi's school that "Observers and students came from all over Europe to see and to teach in his school." He "resented the brutal discipline which for ages had characterized all school instruction, believed it by its very nature immoral, and tried to substitute for this a strict but loving discipline—a 'thinking love', he calls it— and to make the school as nearly as possible like a gentle and refined home." The contribution which he made to education was not due primarily to any unique intellectual fitness, but rather to his intense sincerity and to the loftiness of the motive that impelled him to render service to the world in the interest of human learning.

But we are not living in the past, though we may learn from it. If it took great teachers to produce great men yesterday, it will require great teachers to-day if we are to have a great civilization to-morrow. For that great trinity of influences, the Church, the home, and the school, must continue to provide for the State her citizens and for society her saviors. Dereliction at either of these points will compromise the effectiveness of the other two and damage the final product for which the world is waiting.

It is assumed that any sort of education, whether promoted by the State or by the Church, that is not Christian is inadequate. With this in mind, it is interesting to note what Dr. W. P. Few, President of Trinity College

(now Duke University), North Carolina, has to say on this subject:

> I must content myself with these illustrations. In short the point is this: the aim of all genuine Christian education is—fruits in the soundness of men, soundness of body, mind, and character. It should produce the fruits of a body that is disciplined and fortified for its tasks, of a mind that is trained and furnished, and of a certain cogency of character that always carries with it the ability to think straight and to think through to right conclusions and gives the power to know the truth and the will to live the truth.
>
> This conception of education must change the whole place and function of education in human society. For example, it will elevate the teaching profession. The elevation of the teaching profession does not depend, as is so often said, upon higher salaries, better technical training, or more elaborate equipment, but upon giving it the proper dignity and importance in our life.
>
> This involves a new and truer popular understanding of education. And education, as we believe, we must come to regard not as an agency for developing skilled wage earners or experts in knowledge, but for the building of character, the making of men and women. This defining of education to include not merely the training of the hands or the mind, but the shaping of the whole personality, makes the teaching profession a great art in which excellence is as well worth striving for as in poetry or architecture and in which success is perhaps harder to achieve; for this art deals with the most difficult as well as the most precious material in the world.[4]

As to the part that the teacher must play in the world of to-morrow, we may call attention to a statement made by Ellwood P. Cubberly, of Stanford University, California, which is as follows:

> A national religion is inconceivable with us, and a great national army we do not need or want. We are thrown back then upon our systems of public

[4] *Christian Education Monthly*, January, 1922, p. 5.

> education, the public press, and our political life as the great molding and unifying forces in our most heterogeneous national life, and of these three the school easily stands first as the force which ultimately shapes the other two. Upon the public school teacher, then, and upon those who direct the policies of our schools, in reality rest the burden of the future of our free democratic institutions and the welfare of our national life.[5]

Dr. John Adams, Professor of Education at the University of London, and Emeritus Principal of London Day Training College, has this to say in reference to the art of teaching:

> It is one thing to know and quite another thing to teach. That remarkable man, Lord Kelvin, whose knowledge was as wide as the world and as deep as the sea, was not a good teacher, in spite of his knowledge, and I speak from experience, as he was my own teacher. We who studied under him learned in spite of his methods of teaching rather than because of them. In other professions, the apprentice serves a long term of training before he steps out into his life work, yet the professor, immediately on graduation, begins to profess, steps immediately into his chair as professor of this or that, when, often, he either has no training of experience in teaching, or is far better fitted for research work than for lecturing or teaching.
>
> Mere scholarship is not enough to make a successful teacher. The born teachers, the men and women with natural ability to impart to others what they have learned, from only two and one-half to three per cent of our teachers to-day. The ordinary man who essays to teach may, and very often does, begin by spoiling his first class, and continues by getting his own training at the expense of the students under him, so that these early students are considered incompetent because they do not absorb mentally his teachings, when, in reality, the fault lies entirely in the manner in which the educational material is presented.[6]

[5] "Public Education in the United States," p. 500.

[6] *Dearborn Independent*, March 22, 1924, "Teaching the Professor How to Profess," by Harry H. Dunn.

In other words, Dr. Adams, who certainly is competent to speak, thinks that every teacher should be able to do at least three things: get the mental background of the student, learn to present facts in such order as to appeal to the pupil, and use such illustrations as will drive the thoughts home. He also thinks that we are approaching a period in education when teachers will first be trained to teach.

Just at this juncture it may be well to note the fact that one hundred thousand teachers in the public schools of America are less than twenty-one years of age, and thirty thousand have had no training beyond the eighth grade. Nor is this all. At least three hundred thousand others have had no special preparation for the work of teaching. However sincere may be these youthful and non-expert teachers, the effect of this lack of maturity and of professional preparation will undoubtedly be reflected in the lives of the ten million boys and girls now under their tuition.

What man wants to take his case to a lawyer who has not had at least some years of experience? Most of us prefer to go to a man past middle life, with long years of experience. In medicine we do not want a beardless youth to prescribe for us nor to operate on us. And some of us at least prefer a minister not under forty, and preferably over fifty years of age. It takes experience and time to mature minds. This is true with the teacher as well as with any other place of leadership or high efficiency. The man called to be the Commander-in-Chief in the Allied Army of the World War was far past that time in life when a man is supposed to have reached his maximum of efficiency. When the fortunes of the world were in the balance, discretion and judgment were at a premium. For this same reason Clemenceau, the Tiger of France, was called to the place of leadership when French soil was being desecrated.

While it is asking too much to expect that all teachers should have attained to that age of maturity most desirable, nevertheless an increasing number of them should have reached that degree of maturity and character to be able to impress themselves in a forceful way upon the formative minds and hearts of the students under their care. The situation as it now stands has been complicated by two or three situations.

First of all, too many fine men are entering other professions and callings than teaching. This is partly true because there are larger financial rewards in many of the other callings. Especially is this the case in the commercial ventures that are open to energetic and daring young men. It is not admitted that the financial returns are sufficient to determine a vocation of usefulness in life. Nevertheless, in many cases men do yield to this motive. It may be that teachers themselves do not encourage their own children to enter the teaching profession because of their own experience with the limitations of an economic sort. Not long ago the author sat at a banquet table by the side of a professor of history who is a Ph.D. He said: "When we were college boys 'hard times' were common. We did not know anything else; but it is different now. In those days, by comparison, the professors lived very well. I do not know that I care for my son to become a professor."

Then, again, it often happens that as soon as a young man shows any special gifts for teaching he is called to take charge of some city school, and thereafter his talents are relegated to administrative work rather than to teaching. An interesting question develops at this point: How many of these superintendents actually teach their teachers how to teach? Of course, it is common to have a meeting of the teachers, and to talk over the problems incident to the school. But the question in

mind is: How many actually undertake the work of making the teaching corps itself more efficient in the fine art of instruction, or rather how to instruct their pupils? One teacher, who became an adept at this sort of thing, was called away from his native State to a position in a State institution. So it appears that the very man who begins to magnify his opportunity is immediately removed from it to some other place of service. This means that under the law of promotion those who achieve are called from the scenes that need their contributions most.

Another fact that cannot be overlooked is that so many persons teach just for a few years, and then engage in some other vocation. It is admitted that we have no right to try to restrict the liberties of others. However, when these persons teach for only two or three years, and know in advance that they do not mean to make teaching their life work, it is proper to enumerate this as one of the items that may impair the perfect efficiency of our educational program. However fine may be the character of the young man or woman who is rendering this service, the fact that it is rendered while in an apprenticeship period means that the work done cannot be of the same order as when rendered by one who has made teaching a profession. We can admit that these young teachers have been needed to supply the demand made by the multiplicity of schools and an increasing number of students. This admission, however, does not destroy the truth involved in the facts set forth.

There was a time when more men were willing to devote their talents and time to the one thing of teaching. Within the lifetime of many persons now living there were men who deliberately went out in their youth to teach school, and in old age were still engaged in this work. No doubt in many States the names of cer-

tain of these teachers are household words to-day. To be a little more specific, in South Carolina there was the Waddall School, which not only trained the youth in the neighborhood, but which also prepared men for lives of distinction in many Southern States. Col. A. R. Banks, also of South Carolina, won a name for himself because of his success as a teacher, and especially as a disciplinarian. Then there is the far-famed Webb School, at Bellbuckle, Tenn. This school is being conducted to-day by the son of the founder. The family has won wide recognition because of distinct teaching ability continued from father to son. Why should there not be more men to-day willing to become teachers and to remain teachers for life?

It is proper to consider the fact that more men of distinct ability are needed in the teaching profession. Too much praise cannot be given to the devoted women who have made teaching their life long vocation. No doubt a large part of the teaching for many years to come, if not always, will necessarily be done by women. This is particularly true with reference to the lower grades. However, the time has come when there is a feeling among teachers themselves that there should be a larger number of men connected with the schools, especially in high school and in the junior high school. This is true particularly with regard to the boys. There comes a time in the life of most boys when they need a man of the masculine type as a disciplinarian, if not as a teacher. No doubt many a boy in the adolescent period could be saved by having a man in charge of him who is able to have the mastery over him. It is one of the facts of youth that it is given to hero worship. Moreover, it is not wanting in generosity. It delights to honor those deserving of honor. It is little short of a tragedy that anyone should ever stand in a schoolroom who is not able to command this hero worship.

Still another matter engages our attention. It is the lack of special preparation for teaching on the part of those who teach, whether for a short time or for a longer period. No doubt it is true that teachers are to some extent like poets, "born, not made." It is certainly true that studying methods of teaching, with no native tact, can never secure real competent service in the classroom. Occasionally one with meager college opportunities, but with this genius for teaching, is more than efficient from the beginning. This, however, cannot be regarded as a rule. If it requires a physician years to learn how to diagnose a case, and then administer the proper prescription, and if it requires a lawyer years of intense application to get ready to conduct cases in court, it may be assumed that in so high and holy a calling as that of teaching the time element in preparation must of necessity enter in. Too many schools that claim to conduct a sort of clinic in preparation of their teachers to teach give too little time to this. What can a young girl learn about the art of teaching by observing and being an under-teacher for *six weeks?* For an institution to make the claim that it is turning out pupils, by reason of this, qualified to teach, would be ludicrous if it were not little short of a tragedy.

That there are institutions of learning throughout the country that are making a desperate effort to make adequate provision to train young men and women to be teachers, so that they will be able not only to impart knowledge, but possess in themselves a knowledge content sufficient to be able to impart it, is encouraging as we face the future. But until a larger number of prospective teachers shall be led to avail themselves of this adequate preparation, our school system will continue to suffer.

Moreover, we are not going to get anywhere until more teachers dedicate their lives to the high and holy

cause of teaching. They must be willing to spend the necessary years in order to get the actual experience required before their service can reach a maximum degree of efficiency. Then they must permit the slow accretion of learning and wisdom to enlarge, mature, and ripen their own lives that they may then be in position to accomplish a worth-while service.

In dealing with the subject of the teacher, we are dealing not only with the matter of knowledge and its impartation, but we are dealing with the fact of personality and its transmission. The personal influence of the teacher is very far-reaching. The century plant lives for a hundred years to bloom, and, blooming, dies. The average teacher does not remain in the profession long enough. Personality does not reach its growth in a few days. The limit of any teacher's influence is qualified by his development of personality. Indeed, this matter of the personality of the teacher is of vastly more importance in the long run than his skill in imparting knowledge. We will forget much that we learn from books, but we will never forget the influence of the lives that touched ours when we were young.

H. G. Wells has said: "The teacher—whether mother, priest, or schoolmaster—is the real maker of history; rulers, statesmen, and soldiers do but work out the possibilities of cooperation or conflict the teacher creates."

The opinion of H. G. Wells is worth no more than that of any other man of like ability; but it is likely that all men of any wide experience will agree with him in the far-reaching influences which he ascribed to a teacher. Assuming that this general conception is any way near correct, then it follows that teaching should be a profession, not lightly entered upon, flippantly used, or easily cast aside. The responsibilities involved are too great, and the danger of frustrating young lives and wrecking character is too serious.

The teacher, if he is to achieve the largest good, must magnify his calling. He must always be aware of the possibilities open to him to touch and make great lives out of his pupils. It is said that John Trebonious, of Eisenbach, when he entered the schoolroom in the morning, made a bow to his pupils. He treated them with such deference and courtesy because, as he expressed it, before him were probably future magistrates, burgomasters, and other dignitaries. Is it surprising that from this school should have come Martin Luther, the leader in the Reformation?

Teachers should reflect not simply the sentiment of the age to which they belong, but they should be able to create sentiment and to shape it. Unless there are persons in the community who are able to live above the standard which society desires, and then to exert an influence to lift the remainder to a higher level, we can make no progress upward. Ministers and teachers must not only supply the vision, but be leaders in the development of new ideals for the public, and in forming and fashioning the manners and morals of the people. The pulpit may cry itself hoarse, but if it is not supported by the schoolroom, the Church will be handicapped in its efforts to lead along moral and religious lines. It will take both the preacher and the teacher, and both working overtime, to stem the present tide of worldliness, and lift society to the moral and ethical standard which civilization has a right not only to expect, but to demand.

Moreover, the teachers of to-day are engaged in the work of training the parents and the preachers of to-morrow. If they fall down on their job, we may expect inadequate homes in the next generation, inefficient preachers, and false doctrines from our pulpit. By the failure of the teacher a vicious circle is started, reaching to the home in the next generation, through it

to the pulpit, and the next crop of teachers will represent a lower order. The spiral curve upward must take its departure from the schoolrooms in which the teachers are dedicated to a high and holy service. Granting that the home life of to-day is not up to the standard of forty years ago, and granting that the same measure of orthodoxy and the clear note in doctrinal sermons is no longer heard, we inquire, what is the cause? Immediately all of the fault is laid at the door of the home. But why have the homes that have produced the boys and girls now in the public schools failed? Was there a failure on the part of their teachers? Did they fail in the formative years to get clear-cut, doctrinal conceptions of religion? Were their ethical ideals so ennobled that they could live above the social fog? In asking these questions we once more call attention to the fact that the teacher has a higher mission than merely to teach the subject. He must not only teach men something they should know, but he must teach them how to live, and, what is even more important, show them how by his own life and example.

True, this is no low standard which we have set for the teacher. Neither is it a low calling to which he has been called. Nor are the issues at stake trivial. Moreover, we think the time has come to consider the fact that there has been a great hubbub in educational circles, that the teacher should have the right and the liberty to think and teach the truth as he sees it. The great cry has been that he must be unhampered in his pursuit of knowledge. Indeed, in those cases where certain teachers become more or less notorious, not because of the truth of their pronouncements, but on account of the heresy contained in them, the whole educational world insisted that in the interest of truth these vagaries should be allowed. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. If we are to take the bridle off the

dispensers of heresy and nonsense in the name of truth, then why not leave the teachers absolutely free to pronounce their moral and religious opinions, even if they should be of a sectarian nature? Certainly religious liberty, to impose one's personality upon the formative minds of young people, should be as freely granted as to allow a floodtide of infidelity at variance with the plain teachings of the word of God.

We protest against licensing teachers to teach folly in the name of liberty, and at the same time keeping muffled those who have messages fresh from God. If we are to liberate any, let us liberate all. If freedom is demanded to do anything, it certainly should be to teach that which is right and to promulgate the true and tried doctrines that have stood the test of the centuries.

Every legitimate calling on earth should grant the opportunity for one to do that which is right. Therefore, whatever is right for a teacher to do, he should assume the liberty of doing it. It is altogether possible that too many of the teachers in the public school system and in the State institutions, and in the independent schools and colleges not under denominational control, feel that they have not the liberty which they ought to have in order to put on an aggressive program in the hope of developing morality, religion, and character. That too many teachers have this fear regarding their rights no one will deny. If they should continue to feel this way about it, it will be more or less disastrous to the moral well-being of the nation. The present situation in America and the needs of the boys and girls of this generation require that those who have been called to teach shall put away their timidity.

Comenius as a teacher was more interested in the development of character and personality than he was even in supplying information. His object as expressed by himself is stated as follows:

> I call that a school perfectly fulfilling its mission which is a place for the building up of a genuine manhood, where the spirit of the learner is baptized into the glory of knowledge and wisdom, quick to understand all things secret and revealed, where the emotions of the soul are brought into full harmony with all the virtues, the heart so won by the love of God and filled with it, that it is possible for all who are intrusted to the school to be led into true wisdom, to become accustomed even here on earth to lead a heaven-like life.[1]

Of course we understand that the great problem before the educational world is to secure enough adequately prepared and morally disposed teachers. The President of one of the largest institutions in the South, speaking about the qualifications desirable, said to the writer: "They can't be had!" He knew that there were many very valuable men and women engaged in the high and noble work of education, but he also knew that there were not nearly enough to meet the urgent demand. Until the supply has been adequately increased in number, and until these teachers have been both morally and intellectually prepared to do their work, the world must still suffer.

Just at the present time the immediate problem is to ascertain how we can use those that we now have, so as to secure larger and better results. Unquestionably there shall of necessity have to be developed a sentiment to extend the field of effort on the part of the teachers. This can be done by the colleges if they will send this idea down through the avenues which they have established with the schools. The superintendents and principals of the schools will have to be mobilized and be made to realize that their work is manifold; the public is looking for results. The raw product being sent to the schools is represented by boys and girls to be taught and trained. The results will be measured

[1] Kemp, "History of Education," p. 211.

not simply by what they learn, but by what they achieve and how they live. It is possible for us to turn out of our schools a race of mentally cultivated heathen. It will be a great task to turn out millions of boys and girls with sharpened intellects, with refined feelings, with ethical ideals, with moral courage, and with the Christian purpose to do right at any cost—and above all to glorify God.

But some one says that the schools of the communities and of the State are not to border too closely upon the religious. Why not? Has the State repudiated God? Does not the Chief Magistrate of this country have to take the oath of office on the Holy Bible? We claim to be a Christian nation. Why regard the Holy Book when swearing witnesses and magistrates, and at the same time fear to allow those in the service of the State such liberty as their conscience may dictate in teaching its precepts? With the new day that we face there must come the new liberty to the teacher in every school, whether of the Church or of the State, to proclaim that which is believed and maintained by the most devout of this age.

Almost as great a tragedy, if not as great, faces the Churches in the matter of the teachers in their Sunday schools. Here again are found men and women of liberal culture and of great devotion to God, who are spending much time gladly and freely in trying to serve the kingdom of righteousness as Sunday school teachers. All praise to these! Again, a large number of innocent and pure-minded young persons are doing the best they can to teach the classes assigned to them. As to their piety and good intentions, no possible question can be raised. The pity is that so often their preparation has been inadequate to enable them to render the high service that opportunity presents to them. It is not to these two classes that we have mentioned that we now

invite attention. In the Church to which the writer belongs, at least, there is a surfeit of teachers whose conduct and behavior between the Sabbaths does not comport with their high calling. Church people should decide between cards and Christ. If nothing will do them but to chaperon balls, let them resign as teachers and Sunday school officials.

It is understood that the program of carrying out education as properly defined must embrace the hearty cooperation of the preachers as well as the teachers. Nor is it denied for one minute that there are faint-hearted ministers who are unconsciously intimidated by worldly congregations and lukewarm Church officials. Indeed, it sometimes happens that they find more opposition to religious fervor right among those that they have the right to expect to be first in promoting it. Again, it is possible that many of the choice spirits, just as in the case of teachers, have sought to find a way out without being handicapped by the small vision of the average congregation. That he has done a dangerous thing to stand in the way of the call of God no one will deny. That this very thing is done frequently, no one who is familiar with the situation will question. Yes, we need stronger preachers, more courageous, more devoted, and possessed more and more with the spirit of the martyrs. In the pulpit to-day will be found men who are willing to pay the price, just as in the teaching profession there are those who have counted well the cost. The trouble is, there are not enough of these now committed to this great call of fostering a a civilization. The importance of the work demands the best.

Let us pause here to give credit to whom credit is due, by saying that the best that now obtains in the life of to-day is largely the result of the influence of devoted teachers and preachers, inspiring men and

women to live worthy lives, to rear and nurture and cultivate their families in a proper manner, and to exert influences wholesome and salutary for society and the Church at large. Moreover, it is well to add that in the institutions of the State can be found men whose names might well be mentioned here in words of praise but for the fact that we might inadvertently omit to name some worthy man or woman. That there is an increasing consciousness of responsibility on the part of these leaders in education, is almost certainly true.

If we would understand the far reaches of a teacher's life, we might name only one. We refer to the late Dr. James H. Carlisle. Probably no bishop, minister, or teacher influenced more young men in the latter half of the nineteenth century in all the South than did this devoted, God-fearing teacher. One bishop who had been president of a college sent his son from another State to put him under the influence of Dr. Carlisle. Another bishop sent his son all the way from Kentucky to South Carolina in order to have him under the influence of this man. If teachers would learn of their possibilities, and if they would understand the scope of their high calling, they are invited to go and learn of him who "being dead yet speaketh."

While Dr. James H. Carlisle stands in a class in point of moral grandeur almost alone, still there have been and are many faithful teachers. The pity is that there are not more. No doubt many young men of to-day can far surpass him in teaching the subjects which he taught. It is to be doubted whether any can impose the power of personality as he did. The fact is, the secret of his influence was not in his scholarship, but in his lofty and sublime character.

After all, what the world needs to-day is not more scholars, but more *men and women* in the teaching pro-

fession. This is not said to reflect upon those who are performing their duties well; it is only said so that the time may come when no unworthy man or woman will dare to attempt so high or so holy a task as that of teaching a child, unless prepared in heart as well as in head.

Why should not great men be called to a great task? Men are expected to yield to the call to the ministry regardless of what offers the world may make for their time or for their talents; why should not men and women feel called to the task of teaching? Not until some motive such as this inspires them to their work will we have the kind in sufficient numbers that the world needs and for which it is suffering.

Oftentimes, when the pupils do not get along well in school, the fault is not with them, but with their teachers. Certainly no teacher that does not deserve respect can hope to get it. It is little short of a crime to compel children to grant deference to persons to whom deference is not due. In almost every case a student marks well and appreciates a worthy teacher. The generosity of youth is one of its most outstanding characteristics. Older people may fail to respond to the right motive, but seldom is this true in the case of the developing young. Likewise, they are hero-worshipers. If there is anything to worship in the teacher, you may be sure that their thoughts of admiration will be centered there.

It is little short of injustice to require a pupil to admire one whom he does not respect. The problem, then, in education, is to maintain the respect and the confidence of the children in their teachers by making it possible for them to do so without doing violence to their sense of justice or right. With proper teachers they can be inspired. They can also be led. So to a remarkable degree our educational future hinges upon the kind of teacher that we should provide for.

A smattering knowledge of an inadequate normal school course will in no sense take the place of heartfelt interest and earnest desire to help others and to build up character on the part of a teacher. Even university diplomas, while they may show mental ability, do not reveal the moral attitude or the spiritual determination. It is not what teachers know, but what they are ready to make available, that counts in the schoolroom. And more than their knowledge lies the attitude touching how and what part of their knowledge shall be made available, and the use to which it shall be put.

There are thousands of parents and thousands of homes whose happiness and peace of mind are now being held in the hands of public-school teachers and professors in the colleges that their children attend. But this is not all, though it is worth something, to have consideration for the tranquillity of so many people. The future of civilization and the well-being of society in the next generation are largely at stake. The boy and the girl of to-day will be the man and the woman of to-morrow. These reasons require that those who serve even for a year or two years, until marriage or business or professional life shall take them away from the schoolroom, should be willing to bear their present responsibility as those who must account to the future.

Even though we cannot claim the girl teachers of to-day forever, we can lay the responsibility of their utmost endeavor during their short period of service, especially when the issues at stake are so immense. Nor can we invade the rights of men to change their careers. Nevertheless, while they teach it should be their major endeavor. Having said this, it is evident that society needs a larger number of men and women who are wedded to the profession of teaching, not for a day or a year, but for a lifetime. It takes years to master any vocation or profession. In one so high and holy, it is

hardly fair to leave it before the apprenticeship period is over. A surgeon should never abandon his profession; too many lives have to be sacrificed while he is learning it. Are the destinies of children less precious than the bodies of patients?

Revering the worthy teachers of to-day, may we not hope for better for to-morrow?

CHAPTER VII

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

In dealing with a subject so significant as Moral and Religious Education, we are at once brought face to face with the possible limitation that exists in the case of any sort of education. The "educability" of the individual becomes our first question.

Personality unfolds after being beaten upon from many directions. We have heredity, environment, and the distinct efforts made by teachers, parents, and preachers to influence the individual to know what is right, in the first place, and then to do it, in the second. Here again, we face the question as to how far the individual is independent of these influences, and to what extent he will act in spite of them, on the one hand, or ignore them, on the other.

Viewed from the strict inferences that are to be logically drawn from the study of heredity, the teacher could have little hope in the case of any pupil. This is true in the case of all pupils who are not descended from bright parents and from those who are fond of learning. In the case of these the teacher is almost superfluous, because what nature has done art can scarce improve upon.

No sane mind can question the tremendous fact of heredity. Every Guernsey and Berkshire Club in the country is evidence of the fact that agriculture and industry are conscious of this law. It is hardly necessary to review the studies of Galton, Mendel, and Darwin to refresh our minds in reference to this fact. Even

Darwin himself, as a scientist, is a distinct illustration of the course of heredity. His tendency toward the natural sciences was inherited from his grandfather, Erasmus Darwin. It is said that the grandfather actually believed in the volition of plant life. He was the author of many books along the lines which distinguished his grandson, Charles Darwin.[1]

As a matter of fact, Darwin's discoveries in the study of heredity should deal the deathblow to the theory of the evolution of species, which hypothesis he proposed and which many modern scientists have assumed to be a fact. He took the position, after painstaking research, that all species tend to breed true. He did find that there was a variation from the normal or the standard to the extent of from ten to twenty per cent in extreme cases. These were known as fortuitous variations. That is to say, they were accidental. Now these variations tended to breed true to themselves, just as in the case of any other object like tends to beget like. It was by seizing upon this fact that he improved the fantail, the pouter, and the tumbler pigeons. He merely seized upon the law of inheritance, and by artificially breeding the variations from the normal or mean he developed wide varieties of the same species. However, it must be noted that in no case was he able to create a new species. He simply used the law of heredity in accentuating varieties by inbreeding and cross-breeding.[2]

Too much pains cannot be given to an understanding of how far the innate characteristics of the individual determine his course, and to what extent, if any, he can be imposed upon or affected by influences from without

[1] "New International Encyclopedia," Vol. 5, p. 654 (Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905).

[2] "Origin of Species," pp. 18-29, 33; Wallace, "Darwinism," 89-92, 435.

of any sort whatsoever. It has already been scientifically demonstrated that acquired characteristics cannot be transmitted in heredity. The tails of kittens might be amputated for a thousand years, but all cats born would continue to have long tails. Nor can a man give by inheritance to his son any gift that he has acquired. What he does give to his son is the capacity for acquiring. This capacity he in turn received from his ancestors. Heredity, then, is like a family heirloom that is handed down, unimpaired, from sire to son. Such changes as occur, come simply from the variation of something like twenty per cent from the mean plus the changes which result as the consequences of marriage into another family strain. The mixing of the characteristics is in the blending of the chromosomes. This amphimixis, of course, under Galton's law, will give to the new offspring half of his characteristics, physical and mental, as well as moral, from each of the ancestral lines.

What has been accomplished? A new individual has appeared upon the stage of time different from either of his ancestors by half, and yet equal to the sum total of all the inheritances combined in the two. Now, our educational task is first to understand whether or not the variation of the student from one or both of the parents is due to the effect of some new experiment in education, or whether it is the reappearance in a little more potent manner of some dead ancestor trying to reexert himself through his newborn progeny some generations removed. Our problem then of education, when we consider the "educability" of the individual, is not a simple one.

That inheritance is of great importance is generally believed, and is being more and more accepted as a fact. Education, however, has probably not given the attention to this to the same extent as has been done in the

physical aspects of the subject. We have come to the time now when it is necessary to take cognizance of the family stock, as well as to resort to the new processes for measuring intelligence and a physical examination of the subject.

> Applying the observations made upon animal life and man, we will find that a certain characteristic of mind as well as of body is dominant and perpetuates its kind with a great degree of regularity. . . . Many deformities, such as harelip, clubfoot, six fingers, and other characteristics, as color of eyes, hair, and skin, are thus passed on from parent to child, but will not show in every offspring unless both parents have by inheritance the same peculiarity.[3]

It has long been recognized that certain weaknesses appear to be more inheritable than others. It may be that they are not more inheritable, but because of their nature they attract more attention. Insanity is perhaps the most noted one. "Insanity, tendency to crime, and immorality are also almost surely transmitted to their children, especially when, as is frequently the case, both parents are of the same class."[4]

Under this law of heredity some splendid civilizations have perished. Their failure grew out of either ignorance of the law of heredity or a disposition to ignore it.

> Egypt, in the day of her greatness, was white. But the white Pharaohs began to extend their dominion south into the negro land, and to bring back multitudes of captives for laborers and soldiers, special mention being made also in their records that women in large numbers were included.
>
> Interbreeding with these negroes began and continued through many centuries until the country became largely negroid."

[3] "Eugenics in Relation to the New Family Life and the Law of Racial Integrity," Bureau of Vital Statistics, Richmond, Va. pp. 16-17.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

> The climax was finally reached when one of the Pharaohs took to himself a negro wife, his mulatto son, Taharka, succeeding to the throne. The color line has vanished and with it Egypt's greatness.
>
> Assyrian invaders met with no effective resistance. From that day to this Egypt has been a mongrel nation, incapable of initiative, and now dependent upon foreign protection and leadership.
>
> India affords a parallel example. Four thousand years ago the invasion of India by Aryans occurred. These came into contact with a mixed population of white-yellow-black composition.
>
> The conquerors attempted to prevent their own amalgamation with the natives by establishing a rigorous caste system which was not, like the present one, based upon occupation, but on color. This system failed; and though caste is still in force in India, the reason for it no longer exists.[5]

But these are only illustrations of the force of heredity. The child is largely the product of inheritance. True, there is also a personality which is free, but this freedom will tend to exercise itself under motives. Certainly, the most appealing motive will be the sweep of instincts, appetites, and characteristics that have dominated the family stock for a thousand years. Once again we inquire, Is there anything that education can do; if so, what?[6]

In the Jukes family, we have illustrated the effect of a bad inheritance, amenable neither to law, education, nor God. On the other hand, there is the Edwards family, in which to become celebrated was normal and natural.

Luther Burbank has achieved a wider fame by utilizing the facts of inheritance, especially in the field of cross-fertilization, than any other living man. He has recently said:

> Of course, it is not to be assumed that what a man or woman is capable of achieving is solely de-

[5] "Eugenics in Relation to the New Family Life and the Law of Racial Integrity," Bureau of Vital Statistics of Virginia, pp. 16-17.

[6] W. Hanna Thomson, "Brain and Personality."

> pendent upon where he or she was reared. More depends upon who and what their parents were. Heredity comes first, environment second. But environment is a powerful factor and, as far as we know, the environment of the farm is not, as a rule, stimulating.
>
> The exceptional mind only soars in silence. Most of us have need of a powerful environment to which to react.[7]

So while he does give some consideration to environment, nevertheless it is to be observed that he gives the first place to heredity.

What is personality anyway? Is the person the product of his brain or the builder of it? Is he separate from, and superior to, the physical basis of his consciousness? Indeed, does he himself determine along what lines consciousness shall function, with what intensity, and in what field of experience and thought? Or is he the physiological result of the state of health in which he happens to be at any given time? Is thought, then, a secretion of the brain, or does it eventuate from the direct interference of the person determining what shall have the attention of the mind?[8]

Now, it must be borne in mind that personality eludes any physical measurements. Under a microscope the germ-cell of an ox or a man would each carry sixteen chromosomes. There is nothing that a magnifying lens can detect that will tell what the germ will develop into by multiplication. Is there not present, then, that entity which gives individuality, invisible in fact, but presiding over the unfolding?[9]

[7] "Modern Youth—Will It Land Right Side Up?" *Dearborn Independent,* February 21, 1925.

[8] See Elizabeth Severn, "The Psychology of Behavior," p. 4, and Thomson, "Brain and Personality."

[9] "Modern Treatment of Nervous and Mental Diseases," White and Jelliffe, (Vol. 1, pp. 22-28); "State Board Questions and Answers," by R. Max Goepp, M. D., p. 249 (Published by W. B. Saunders Co.)

There are two schools of thinkers. "The one regards the mind as wholly of the brain, and hence the mind can have no existence apart from the brain. The other regards the brain as nothing more than the instrument of the mind, and no instrument can possibly be identical with the agency which uses it."[10]

This does not lessen our problem, but complicates it. For we begin to see that inheritance means the transmission of personality, or that mysterious thing in which is bundled up, like a Pandora's box, the tendencies, capacities, gifts, characteristics, and traits, as transmitted and modified through the mingling of family streams by the process of marriage. The question now is, what can the teacher do? Certain it is, he cannot build a genius, if the materials have not been supplied, any more than a contractor can build a palace without brick and mortar. If, on the other hand, material has been given in abundance, but of such a sort as not to fit together, or to respond to the overtures of the teacher, he can no more secure a complete cultured result than the carpenter can with fragments of stones and brickbats manufacture an establishment for a king. Education can do some things, perhaps. How much can it do, is our problem. Granting that it may brighten the mind, increase the memory, stimulate the argumentative faculties, does it follow that it can also awaken the spiritual and moral aspects of human life? Moreover, can the moral side of life be enlivened and enlarged without first calling the religious life into activitiy? Surely our question is not easy to answer.

> Some would-be reformers or philanthropists appear to rely upon increase of knowledge or of information in the world as the cure for the world's evils. If men's minds were but enlightened, then everything would go well! The physiologist can

[10] "Brain and Personality," by W. Hanna Thomson, M.D., LLD., p. 36.

> only point out that such people, owing to their unfamiliarity with the constitution of this court, are addressing the wrong official. Reason undoubtedly does hold a high position at this court which no one can justly disparage, but at best it is only an adviser of its sovereign. In the future, as this master improves in motives, this official will doubtless be promoted with an increase of authority. But as the world is still constituted, the influence of Reason with the power which actually rules is at all times uncertain, because the effect depends on how the ruler is otherwise disposed. Should the Reason venture to be importunate, it meets with the summary answer of the Roman Cæsar. *Sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratinoe voluntas* (So I will, so I command: For a reason let the wish stand)![11]

Learning, then, may inform the mind without reaching the heart. It is to be doubted if the will will be led into action unless reached through the medium of the affections. It was for this reason that the Master required that he possess the human heart. Even a curriculum that might be expected to develop the moral life might do no more than inform the mind just as the facts in an almanac would.

> Therefore gain the ear of the will first, and everything naturally, because physiologically, follows. The world is to improve, not by an increase of knowing people (desirable as that is), but by an increase among its inhabitants of people with benevolent wills.[12]

This preliminary review of the difficulties in our way may at least assuage our grief if we fail in the success that we set out to attain along the line of moral education. And just here we may also note the fact that we may expect a large number to fail to respond to the approaches of environment and tuition because of the dominance of heredity. Cases of this sort will occur just as they occur among the notables, who, impeded at

[11] Thomson, "Brain and Personality," pp. 263, 264.
[12] *Idem*, p. 264.

every step in their progress, beat their way to the topmost rungs of the ladder of achievement. Take, for instance, the case of Pulitzer, the Russian Jew, who came to America little better than penniless and earned his bread by manual toil. Despite his want of education, he marked a new day in American journalism and left an estate worth multiplied millions, besides endowing a chair of journalism in one of the great universities of America.

Fortunately for our purpose, heredity has not left us bereft of all hope, in that she has bequeathed to humanity, at least to most of her children, the capacity for religion. Samuel Johnson may have been right when he said, "One set of savages is like another." He certainly was right if he had in mind their predilections toward religion. This is manifest in totemism, ancestor worship, and puberty rites.[13]

Moreover, the universality of religion and the human instinct to worship causes us to feel that there is a faculty or a capacity that may be appealed to. If not, in the same way that other mental capacities are reached through educational processes, at least in some way they may be ministered unto. The religious ceremonies of the savages may awaken no response on the part of a more highly civilized folk. Whether song and worship and the distinctly religious ceremonies of the Churches will be necessary to gain this end, is a matter for consideration. Probably the time will never be when organized worship, under the most reverent and devout atmosphere that can be created, can be displaced by any other process. However, it may be, and it is at least worthy of our consideration to ascertain if it cannot be supplemented by other processes. If this be possible, what are the processes to be employed, and

[13] Graves, "A History of Education Before the Middle Ages," pp. 1-15.

what sort of curriculum should be instituted? Indeed, what kind of teacher may be necessary to accomplish this task? Furthermore, has any adequate effort been set forth to determine what can be done? Has any examination been made to see how little has been attempted?

Now, in dealing with a subject such as we have, in which there is an element of speculation as to how far training, moral training, and religious training can reach the individual, we need to give some attention to men who have had a wide observation of life and have come into close contact with many people. It is true that their unsupported conclusions cannot be accepted as scientific data or as conclusive proof. Nevertheless, if it should be found that many minds that had had competent opportunities should be agreed touching any matter, it at least might be used as corroborative and supplementary evidence, and also as strong presumptive evidence of a fact.

There is a widespread belief, at any rate, that the cause of crime and delinquency is due to parental neglect or the failure of the schools to furnish proper moral training. Albert B. Hines, director of the Boys' Club of New York City, "asserts that 80 per cent of the crime in this country is committed by men or boys who have had no religious training." We are told that he finds only thirty thousand boys under religious influence in the city of Brooklyn. As reported by Mabel Abbott in the New York *World,* he says:

> I made a study some years ago of our neighborhood, with the help of a lot of the older boys in the club. We observed the boys on certain blocks on a week-day afternoon, in the evening, and on a Sunday afternoon. We found that 24 per cent of the boys on the week-day afternoon were doing things that were actual violations of law, such as throwing stones at windows, shooting craps, stealing, building

> fires, etc., and that 50 per cent were doing things that were destructive to moral character or dangerous to their lives.
>
> One group we found in a morgue wagon on the East River playing "banker and broker." At night they were congregated in groups in hallways, on corners, in poolrooms, and in motion-picture houses. We had about 200 in the Boys' Club, but the poolrooms had a lot more. On Sunday afternoon we found settlements, clubs, and churches closed, but the poolrooms and so-called "social clubs" were not. We found 100 per cent increase in gambling and 85 per cent increase in fighting.[14]

Corroborating the position taken by Albert B. Hines is Paul F. Voelker, in "The Function of Ideals in Social Education," who found that the boys who had had proper training scored 82.3 per cent, while those with the least possibilities of moral training only scored 42.1 per cent. He also found that the public school group scored 56.8 per cent.[15]

It is needless to say that there is a widespread opinion that the inculcation of religious ideals and moral standards will affect the individual. It is largely because of this fact that churches are kept open, Sunday schools conducted, sermons preached, and revival meetings held.

At this point, however, we postpone the further discussion of moral education in its distinct relations to religion. Just for the moment we will regard it more from the standpoint of pedagogy and training. It will appear that as the language faculty can be developed, or at least assisted to function, so the ethical capacity of the mind may be brought into a larger exercise.

Here again we run into the new pedagogical notions. This of course has in mind particularly the natural unfoldment of the individual and the place of the teacher

[14] *The Literary Digest*, December 27, 1924, p. 31.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

to follow the student, rather than to lead him. That is to say, the teacher must wait for the student to take the first move or show the first sign of movement in any given direction, and then to relate himself accordingly. This system applied to everyday life would lead the automobilist to wait until the car cranked itself and started, and then get aboard and direct its subsequent movements, or at least try to do so, provided a smash-up did not occur before he got aboard.

With reference to this notion, a professor in a State University recently said that there was "never a more pernicious doctrine in pedagogy." He went further and said: "This thing has gotten into the Churches. It has done away with the catechism." Referring still further to the present-day policy, "No use to teach a child anything until he needs it." he said: "He may need it on examination." Moreover, this same educator was led to remark: "I can't help believing that the copy-book had value." Expressing the benefits of the fable, he said: "Fables lost out because we stopped to tell what was patent to all."

Of course the opinion of one professor does not prove a case. But this professor is not by himself. Prof. J. Gresham Machen, Princeton Theological Seminary, has recently said:

> An outstanding feature of contemporary education in these departments is the growth of ignorance; pedagogic theory and the growth of ignorance have gone hand in hand. The undergraduate student is being told that he need not take notes on what he hears in class, that the exercise of the memory is a rather childish and mechanical thing, and that what he is really in college to do is to think for himself and to unify his world. He usually makes a poor business of unifying his world. And the reason is clear. He does not succeed in unifying his world for the simple reason that he has no world to unify. He has not acquired a knowledge of a

> sufficient number of facts in order even to learn the method of putting facts together. He is being told to practice the business of mental digestion; but the trouble is that he has no food to digest. The modern student, contrary to what is often said, is really being starved for want of facts.[16]

Surely a professor in Princeton University is a competent critic of modern pedagogical methods! It is worthy of note that he regards some facts as essential before the individual can begin to build his knowledge into a system or to translate it into a character. Perhaps we have gone a little too far in abandoning the catechetical method and in failing to provide enough memory work to train the memory on the one hand, and to store it with living facts on the other. Certain it is, if the report of a recent visitor to the National Teachers' Educational Association means anything, it means that teachers are very far from being decided on what is a proper curriculum.

Perhaps modern pedagogues might learn something from the Master Teacher, the Man who spake as never man spake. He said to his disciple: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." What did he mean? He meant that Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," showed that he had the truth. In fact, Christ went further and said: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Now, since Peter had the truth, he was given the keys to bind the consciences, the convictions, the ideals, and the judgments of others. Not only so, but he made it clear that he would stand back of whatever Peter did. Peter was to impose his convictions upon the

[16] *Christian Education,* December, 1924, p. 99.

convictions of others. In plain words, he was to be a teacher with authority to teach.

Note that the same teachers who wait for the child to move before they try to get into touch in dealing with important matters like moral and spiritual interests, stand hard and fast for the "blue prints" when it comes to mathematics, biology, science, and modern and ancient languages. Perhaps the pedagogues ought to unify their systems before we proceed further.

There are two methods that may be employed. These methods are set forth by Paul F. Voelkner, Ph. D., as follows:

> There are two methods of moral training. One is by training to right habits, and the other is by inculcating high ideals. These two methods represent divergent views in education. The habit method is Catholic; the idealistic method is Protestant. The habit method of making people good is well exemplified in the old educational system of China, which specified every particular duty that a child was to acquire and which trained him rigidly in the performance of every one of these duties. The idealistic method is exemplified in such education as is given to the Boy Scouts of America, which sets up generalized standards of conduct and which attempts to motivate the Scouts in the performance of their duties in conformity with these general standards.
>
> Further to illustrate the difference between the two methods, let us take so simple a matter as the training of a boy in thrift. To make a boy thrifty by the habit method, he must be taught a satisfaction whenever he saves a penny; he must be taught a specific satisfaction when he saves a nickel; he must be given a satisfactory feeling whenever he saves a dime; and he must be frequently exercised in each one of these specific savings until each one has become a habit. In order to be truly saving, he ought to learn to save, and it would be a long and tiresome process properly to train him so that each specific saving would become habitual. However, this method has the advantage of producing a lasting effect. Very few people ever forget or lose

> the habit of saving pennies, even though in later life they may form the habit of wasting hundred-dollar bills.
>
> To make a boy thrifty by inculcating in him the ideal of thrift is a different process. He must be made to *feel* the desirability of saving in a more general way. Specific instances can be quoted and specific lessons may be drawn by producing a feeling that it is desirable to save for the sake, say, of winning the war, or for the sake of getting money enough to go to college, or for the purpose of providing funds to send a crippled sister to the hospital. This would generate in the boy an ideal which would urge him in the matter of saving and control his purpose to save in very many large and small ways whenever an opportunity presented itself.[17]

The above writer, in emphasizing the fact of "Two Methods of Training," and in giving the larger emphasis to the inculcation of ideals, is to that extent in line with the modern tendencies in education. That these ideals should be stimulated to the very utmost no sane mind will bring into question. It is not to combat this point, but to give a larger emphasis to the other method of training, the one that has been employed with such remarkable effect through so many centuries. Indeed, may it not be well to measure the new method in teaching by the moral results that we are now achieving? Since it appears that all thinkers who have in mind the social good are perturbed because of the rapid increase of crime and immorality, especially in the last fifty years, it might be well to see if this increase in evil was simultaneous with the adoption of these new pedagogic notions. Moreover, it might be well to inquire if the increase in crime has been in proportion to the general adoption of these notions.

That distinguished teachers may approve and indorse new principles of education in no sense proves the case. It may still be that a very much larger number dissent,

[17] *The Workers' Council*, March, 1925, p. 5.

but have failed to say so. It is always the new propagandist that produces the new literature and announces with vigor the new notions to the world. Those who adhere to ideas that have been formerly accepted are slower to run to the defense of that which they think is accepted as true by the great multitude.

As an indication of how some of these propagandists are thinking, we call attention to the following quotation:

> The current school practice places emphasis on initiative and self-reliance. There have been many educators, from the time of Rousseau to the present, who have criticized the school because it subjects the child too completely to the will of his elders. It has been pointed out that the development of strong intellectual and moral character depends upon independent effort and discovery.[18]

Here once more we have a half-truth. It is freely granted that the highest development of strong character and the best training in strengthening the moral and the mental life grow out of individual initiative, practice, and exercise. Nevertheless, it does not follow that in the immature days of youth there is not an incessant need of guidance, direction, sometimes prohibitions, and at other times absolute restraint, and even the exercise of punishment. Admitting that according to the minds of many moderns the author of the Proverbs may be a little out of date, nevertheless there may be a deposit of truth even in the sayings of so ancient a writer. Let us hear what he says: "He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes."

A preacher, not so many years ago, was praising the attitude of the Master when as a lad he was found disputing with the wise men, and replied to his mother,

[18] "The Why and How Teacher," Vol. 2, p. 4, David Cook Publishing Company.

"Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" The inference from the message of this minister was in keeping with many other pedagogic ideas of to-day. In effect it was as much as to say, "Stand aside, and let the boy have room." A mother of five sons was in the congregation that morning. She managed to keep silent until after the sermon was over. Indeed, the minister was left to go his own way and deliver the sermon again elsewhere. But if he had heard the experience of the mother in the matter of actually handling five boys, he would have been a wiser minister, if less orthodox in his modern pedagogical ideas.

Not long ago Henry Ford was being sued by the Chicago *Tribune*. It was brought out that Ford was ignorant of many facts of history; that he was not even much of a speller. It is said that he replied that he could hire helpers to transcribe his letters and articles, but that he still had for convenient use the practical wisdom which he had accumulated in achieving his large success. This incident has been seized upon to enforce once more the half-truth of modern-day education, and along with it Dr. John Dewey is introduced as a witness in point:

> People often wonder why it is that so many learned persons seem so nearly useless in life and so many who never secured much "higher" education succeed conspicuously in all branches of effort. Dr. John Dewey, who is himself at once the most learned and the most practically successful educator in America (as acknowledged by his colleagues), answers this puzzle. He says that "men of vast erudition are often swamped by the mere bulk of their learning, because memory, rather than thinking, has been operative in obtaining it"; while men of little book-learning are "often able to put to effective use every ounce of knowledge they possess, because their knowledge has been achieved in connection with the needs of specific situations."[29]

[29] "The Why and How Teacher," Vol. 2, p. 4.

Granting that learning in itself is inadequate, nevertheless it is required. The universities that grant the Ph.D. degree expect ability and distinct ability in the art of independent investigation and original research. Particular attention is now drawn to the fact that they do not fail to require a very wide and general culture. A candidate for this degree, taking the course in graduate history, was required to read a minimum of 2,500 pages of history as parallel reading in connection with a half year's work, giving a credit of one and one-half units. This, of course, was in addition to the regular text used, which covered at least 200 pages, and in addition also to the preparation of a paper showing distinct research work on some topic germane to the field studied. This is said not in criticism of the work required for the credit given nor in criticism of the extent and character of the work required for the Ph.D.; it is only said to show how absurd much of this argument, which in effect is against learning the letter of things, when the most renowned institutions in the world require the widest knowledge of the letter as a preparation for doing original work to get the most coveted degree as a badge of ability to think.

Again, Professor O'Shea, we are told, calls attention to the fact that the public school teachers of America, in recent years, have been "trying to base their methods of teaching entirely upon the psychological principle that a child learns by doing, rather than by memorizing." He further declares, so we are told, that experimental studies show that pupils may be able to recite rules correctly, and not be able to apply them to the actual problems of life. He further states that "word *knowledge*" does not give understanding of concrete situations, unless the student has translated his rules into concrete terms. He tells us that a new term has originated in educational literature: "This is the

term *dynamic*, which is contrasted with the term ***static.***" But to quote:

> Professor O'Shea tells us that all the changes that are taking place in methods of teaching in our public schools are based on the principle that children can gain real knowledge that will be of service to them only by concrete experience. He goes on to explain: "It is probably no exaggeration to declare that every public teacher in our country who has felt the spirit of American public school education is endeavoring to devise new and better ways of applying dynamic principles in all his teaching, and that the educational magazines, literally hundreds of them, are filled with the accounts of experiments showing how various subjects or studies can be taught in a more dynamic way than they have been taught before."
>
> He also tells us that the one great purpose is to teach pupils to master things and actions, and that in no subject is the dynamic principle being applied with greater success than in teaching children to become good citizens. It remains for Sunday-school teachers to apply the dynamic principle in teaching children to attain moral and spiritual mastery over their environment.[20]

Once more, in heartiest agreement with the *dynamic* aspects of education, it does not necessarily follow that this objective will be assured by throwing overboard rules and regulations, by ceasing to read fables, memorize Commandments, and by being drilled in the great precepts of Scripture, as well as the mottoes of wisdom accumulated out of the past. Why should there be any controversy at this point? Indeed, with a firm foundation of mottoes it ought to be all the more easy to get up some *dynamic*. The truth is, both systems of education need to be employed. A man needs to eat meat. This does not mean that he should stop eating bread. Because he is a bread-eater is no reason that he should abstain from tickling his salivary glands by the use of a savory cut of roast beef. If he expects to work with

[20] "The Why and How Teacher," Vol. 2, p. 5.

his brain or with his brawn, he will not only need the bread, but also the roast beef. In other words, we need to employ the old method as well as the new. One school unfolds from within; the other is imposed from without—we need both methods.

The question of individuality in the case of the student has been brought up as an argument for the new methods in education. Before discussing this point, if it is to be seriously considered, why not knock the standardizing processes of education in the head at once and be done with it? Has not the whole movement been for many years, especially in the graded schools from the kindergarten up, to send all pupils through a common mold, having them all cover the same grounds in the same length of time and in the same way? It is true that there are a few electives in the high school, but the work done in any of these courses is the same for every member of the group that elects them. Wider electives are granted in the colleges, yet there is a standard basis for entrance into any college of recognized standing. Once in college there is a minimum of work which is required of all students who are candidates for a degree. Certain subjects must be taken up to a certain point. This does not indicate any wild enthusiasm for the care of the individual in the sense of preserving his individuality inviolate. Then why argue for a new method of teaching to achieve something which is not practiced by those who commend it?

On this point Angelo Patri has said:

> Children are the highest expression of Nature's art. To them she gives the longest period of infancy, the richest potentialities, the most bewildering and bewitching variety. She would grow men fine and free, strong and sure, wise and gentle, each in his own good time, each in his own true way. She would have them differ as "one star differeth from another in glory."

> But we herd them in schools and teach them uniformly, in mass, the same thing at the same time and in the same way at the same rate of speed, only to be faced in the end by the stern decree: My children have the right to be different, and different they shall be. Such is the law.[21]

Certainly, individuality should be preserved. Equally certain, the modern *standardized processes* in education do not tend to preserve it on the one hand, or to develop it on the other. Just as certain is it also true that the new method in education has failed to combat the standardizing process. Even if it did, and should succeed, and individual differences should be taken into account in the teaching of every pupil, would it still follow that maxims, rules, mottoes, and the pressure from the teacher toward good conduct and behavior, as well as exhortation to honesty, honor, uprightness, truthfulness, would be out of place?

Mr. Patri says:

> Conceive of a teacher who believes she is commissioned to show children the way to help themselves and then to stand out of the way while they go at it.

This point is very well answered by Mr. Neumann:

> The difference is strikingly illustrated in a fallacy of Herbert Spencer's in his useful "*Essay on Education.*"[22] He repeats Rousseau's injunction to let all necessary punishments come, if they must, from Nature and not from man. These natural penalties, he says, are constant, direct, impartial, inevitable they do not threaten, but work silently and inexorably where parental indulgence does the opposite. But, before he concludes, Spencer is obliged to warn us against an exclusive following of Nature for the reason that some of her inflictions may be altogether too cruel. Exposure to cold may

[21] *Collier's Weekly*, December 27, 1924, p. 27.
[22] Herbert Spencer, "Essay on Education," p. 217.

bring pneumonia and death. Hence, "the moral reactions called forth from you by your child's actions you should as much as possible assimilate to those which you conceive would be called forth from *a parent of perfect nature.*" How significantly is the point of view here shifted. We are told repeatedly to follow Nature, and then, when we consider the dire possibilities, we must turn from Nature and take as our guide the perfect parent—a being nowhere to be found in the natural order. Some fathers and mothers are assuredly wiser than others, but none are perfect. When Spencer, therefore, directs us to the standard set by the perfect parent, he leaves behind him the realm open to investigation by the methods of science and calls upon a being from the world of ideals.[22]

[22] Neumann, "Education for Moral Growth," p. 126.

CHAPTER VIII

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

THIS is not the time nor the place to discuss the fall of man, much less his depravity, whether total or partial. It is less in order to do so inasmuch as such a large number of thinkers regard man as the unfallen but ascending creature, now with a god-like mind. If, however, we should bear in mind the natural constitution of man in this connection, his disposition in a state of nature to degeneracy, to find recreation in those amusements outside of the religious order, we could better understand the necessity for education to keep the mottoes, maxims, Commandments, and other requirements straight before his eyes at all times.

Mr. Patri has announced a statement worthy of being copied: "No man can measure what Nature has hidden." This statement is made in connection with these words:

> Use the standard tests and measurements toward this achievement rather than as final judgments as to a child's possibilities. No man can measure what Nature has hidden. It must first be brought to light and then its possibilities are beyond human reckoning. Put the tests into the hands of the high school children and teach them to check their own growth and progress by them.[1]

Yes, it is the immeasurable and eluding personality that is not amenable to any of the yardsticks employed by pedagogues that often determines what the individual

[1] *Collier's Weekly*, December 27, 1924, p. 27.

will be. Personality has to register its approval by its reaction to any system employed to help it. It will not hurt to use all devices that are legitimate in order to brace it up to bear the strains of life and to work out its own career in an upright and proper manner.

It is true that Thomas-Tindal and Myers declare that "it is the consensus of opinion that ethical teaching in secondary schools lower than college grade should not be formal in character, but should be an outgrowth of all school activities." We are also told how this teaching may be done:

> It may be promulgated through a variety of expedients—*e.g.*, the utilization of incidental happenings of the classroom involving moral principles; discussion of given situations in real life where decisions must be made as to what is truly ethical practice under those circumstances; consideration of the various virtues as evidenced in the lives of men and women whose characters enlist admiration. Illustrative of the first of these methods of pointing moral truths, the pupil who, through fear of consequences, has told a falsehood, may be led to tell the truth despite results if, under guidance, he is given the vision of the splendor of moral courage and confidence in his own ability to attain thereto.[2]

These writers, however, recognize that there is a place for pure instruction. Whether or not they have been able to draw a definite line as to where instruction should end and guidance begin, is a question which possibly they themselves cannot answer. In their chapter on "Guidance," they say:

> *How Far Guidance Shall be Carried.*—The question then arises: Shall the guidance thought be made to motivate all teaching from the first to the last year of instruction? This seems debatable, many educators holding that the purely instructional element of teaching far outranks guidance

[2] Thomas-Tindal and Myers, "Junior High School Life," p.120.

> in importance in the years preceding and immediately following adolescence. Be that as it may, there appears to be no question that guidance is the dominant note in the middle years of the period of education. Therefore, since the function of the junior high school is to minister to boys and girls during these formative years, piloting them toward the port of worthy manhood and womanhood, it is essential that teachers in that type of school be skilled in matters of guidance.[3]

These authors admit that many educators hold to the purely instructional method of teaching as outranking guidance, just before the years of adolescence and immediately thereafter. May this not mean, then, that what these educators have in mind is really not less instruction at the climax of the adolescence period, but simply *more* guidance? Surely, if all parties are agreed as to the importance of instruction immediately preceding and immediately following the time that a boy changes his voice, and as this gosling age is itself so indefinite as to time, so fugitive as to its durability, and so uncertain as to its manifestations, then we would agree that tuition should never cease in its emphasis while guidance should increase as we approach the cascade period in youth.

Another question. How much of this aversion to maxims, laws, restraints, mottoes, and precepts grows out of the modern sense of liberty, or the spirit of democracy gone to seed, a sort of near-socialism on the one hand and nihilism on the other? Extreme liberalism and modernism in the Churches, student government in the colleges, and child-control in the homes are probably offshoots of this "new freedom." No wonder that law is poorly regarded, that family government has passed away to a large extent, and that crime is increasing in proportion.

[3] "Junior High School Life," p. 12.

> In the days of the French Revolution, Edmund Burke declared that he could no more congratulate the people of France on possessing liberty than he could felicitate them on having a government; but that just as he must know what sort of government they had, so he would have to be informed of what nature was the liberty they enjoyed.[4]

Again, the question is asked, "Shall not the system be judged by its output?" A study conducted by *Collier's Weekly,* and as reported by William G. Shepherd, affords some interesting information. Prof. Calvin O. Davis, of the Department of Education in the University of Michigan, conducted a questionnaire, containing ninety-six questions, which were answered by ten thousand junior high school students. The questions were answered anonymously by students from 175 different high schools scattered through nineteen States. We are told that this questionnaire revealed that "most of these ten thousand children are sheer materialists; in all their answers there in only a glimpse, now and then, of an appreciation of morals or ethics. They fail, in the mass, to recognize the fact that there is such a thing in life as *character,* and when they do recognize character in each other, they put it in a secondary place."[5]

One of the questions asked was, "If you were seeking a leader among the boys and girls of your school, what five qualities would you demand of your leader?" Of the sixteen thousand replies, no one mentioned any of the virtues of life as ranking first. Scholarship came first; personality second; honesty third; cleanliness fourth; character ranked along with a "good mixer." Strange to say, or perhaps it is not strange, the girls placed scholarship, personality, and honesty in the same order as did the boys. But more strange is the fact

[4] Neumann, "Education for Moral Growth," p. 15.
[5] *Collier's Weekly,* December 13, 1924, pp. 14 and 48.

that the boys placed cleanliness as the fourth item, while the girls put "good mixer" as the fourth item, and gave cleanliness the fifth place in importance.[6]

In answering the question, "What is the best thing that school does for you?" thirty-one per cent replied, "Education," and only eighteen per cent said, "It has developed my character." In response to the question, "What are the chief moral qualities exhibited by pupils?" four thousand out of ten thousand did not care to commit themselves. Of this sixty per cent replying, one-third placed honesty first. The other seventy divided between fellowship, clean habits, co-operation, good sportsmanship, high ideals, and courtesy. Less than two thousand voted in favor of honesty as a chief moral quality shown by their fellow pupils.

As to the question, "Has your school a good moral tone?" less than five thousand answered. Of these, 20 per cent thought that the school did not have a good moral tone. Of these thus expressing the opinion, 476 were boys and 531 were girls. The remaining 2,943 girls and 1,631 boys thought that the moral tone was good.

As to regrettable practices, ten per cent of the girls thought that the swearing on the part of the boys was the worst. About one-fifth of the girls thought that the boys smoked too much. Four hundred girls referred to crap-shooting on the part of the boys. Only sixty-seven girls complained of the immoral sex habits of the boys. But five hundred of the girls thought that the boys drank too much. (This five hundred were out of the five thousand reporting.) There were, however, 252 girls who complained of boys telling vulgar stories.

Now, when it came to the boys finding expression for the regrettable conduct of the girls, we learn that ten per cent of the boys thought that the girls used too

[6] *Collier's Weekly*, December 13, 1924, pp. 14-48.

much profane language. Yet it appears that twenty per cent of the girls said the same thing about themselves. A larger number of boys complained of the profane language of the girls than complained of their smoking. A still larger number of boys complained of the cosmetics used by the girls. Only 172 boys out of two thousand complained of the girls overdressing. One hundred and ninety boys thought that the girls "ran out too much at night." Three hundred and eighteen boys claimed that the girls indulged too much in "flirting and petting." Just fifty-four boys out of over two thousand referred to the girls as drinking or telling vulgar stories. Only forty-five of the girls referred to themselves as drinking, and only one hundred of them referred to vulgar stories. It appears that none of them found anything wicked with one another.

Just a little more than ten per cent of the boys and girls admitted that there were any insidious factors in the school to undermine right conduct. These were ascribed to environment, poor discipline, and certain pupils.

As to whether the students would like a course to be given dealing with the matter of marriage, home, and parenthood, 3,239 girls answered—1,482 as being in favor of such a course, and 1,757 as being opposed to it. Among the boys, 2,059 gave expression to their wishes; 917 as favoring, and 1,142 as opposed.

When these young people were interrogated to ascertain the qualities they most admired or desired in the opposite sex, it was learned that the girls placed "good manners" first, good morals second, clean habits and neatness third, and honesty fourth. The boys placed good looks first, intelligence second, personality third, honesty and truthfulness fourth.

In answer to the question, "Is a course in moral education desirable?" 61 per cent of 4,867 who voted

favored it. Among the reasons assigned for favoring it, 12 per cent gave as a reason that it would yield good health habits. Forty-seven per cent said, "It would develop my character." Twenty-nine per cent were in favor of it because it taught decency and courtesy. Nine per cent were in favor because it would develop purity of thought.[1]

Taking these findings as assembled by a professor of education in a great American university, the question is raised, first, whether the new idea in education of following on as the child leads is getting us anywhere. In the second place, a further question is raised as to whether we are gaining ground in morality and in ethical ideas by departing from the maxims, the fables, the Golden Rule, the Commandments, the precepts, and other requirements so long taught. Again, in view of what has gone before, and what we are yet to consider in the discussion of this subject, we would inquire if there is no place for formal education. Especially do we raise this question in its applicability to the matter now under consideration. Is there nothing, then, in the content or the body of study submitted to the student?

Let us look into this subject. Adams, in seeking to apply the Herbartian Psychology to education, illustrates it by presenting a concrete case. He takes three men, one trained in the classics, another in science, as a biologist, and the third a mathematician. They are asked to decipher a hieroglyphic inscription. The mathematician immediately objects on the ground that the classic has the advantage. The biologist likewise objects for the same reason. Whereupon the reply is made that the inscription is neither in Latin nor Greek; but immediately the reply is given that it lies in the line of language and therefore will come easiest to the

[1] *Collier's Weekly*, December 13, 1924, pp. 14-48.

classic. Now, each of these men has had his mind trained by the studies in his respective field. Nevertheless, there has also developed a certain bias due to the subjects in which their minds have ranged and worked for so long a time. Hence, we come to have such terms as the *mathematical mind, philosophical mind, scientific mind.*

Adams enforces the application by way of illustration in the case of a lost will, which of the three men named above will be most likely to discover the lost document? The abstract mind of the mathematician eliminates him from the race. The biologist, because of the patient study he is required to do, might appear to be the proper one to find the lost paper. In the last analysis, however, the classic, because of his wide knowledge and acquaintance with human nature, becomes the most likely one, upon the assumption that there is a large level of human nature connected with the valuable instrument becoming lost. Now each of these minds may be equally well trained, but the fields predispose them to certain possibilities.[8]

While getting our view of "Moral and Religious Education," we must keep in mind the pedagogical possibilities of accomplishing anything in this field. Reference has been made to formal education above, as a fact sometimes in dispute, but more frequently practiced, often maintained by still others, and relied upon by all in many of the branches of human learning and research. This becomes wise if the schools are to put education of any sort into the curricula. Certainly it would appear that such subjects as ethics, the Bible, Church history, and the biography of Church heroes and scriptural characters would furnish a proper curriculum for formal moral and religious education.

[8] Adams, "Herbartian Psychology Applied to Education," pp. 108-110.

But what is the purpose of religious education? There would probably be two answers to this. The Church, whatever else it might have in mind, would certainly include preparation for eternity. True, there are certain religious leaders who refer to the kingdom of God in such a way as apparently to limit it solely to time. Of course, moral education as a by-product will make a better man, while he lives among men, but his destiny is not in time; it is in eternity.

The State, however, is not supposed (at least by some persons) to think beyond the confines of time. Granting this, moral education will be handicapped because of the want of sufficient urge, in that there is nothing beyond the shadows of the grave or above the horizon to inspire right living. In effect, then, the goal which in large measure is now before the schools and colleges of America partakes of a police system, which has passed from clubs to ethical ideals and to the amenities and proprieties of life. Now, we do not believe that this system is adequate. Moreover, we do believe that a great many of the American people believe in eternity and have a right to express themselves in terms of that faith. Nevertheless, we must try to ascertain how far the State would have us go in order to achieve something in the domain of moral education.

As expressed in "An Analysis of the Towner-Sterling Bill," sent out by the National Educational Association, this bill appears to be primarily to promote good citizens. Whether good citizens can be developed on the basis of morality, apart from religion, certainly is a matter of great doubt. But the statement gives it as follows:

> The primary purpose of education from the standpoint of the State and the nation is to develop good citizens. It must be conceded that a citizenry physically, intellectually, and morally sound is essential to the life and prosperity of our republic,

> since a government of the people can be no stronger than the composite citizenry of which it is composed. The privileges and responsibilities of American citzenship are not affected by State boundaries. Whatever tends to elevate and strengthen the quality of citizenship in any State promotes the welfare of the entire country, and any weakness or disorder in any State subtracts from the general health and security of the nation. It becomes the imperative duty of the Federal Government, therefore, to encourage and promote education in all the States to the end that every American child shall have an opportunity for the fullest physical and intellectual development of which he is capable, thereby conserving and developing the human resources of the nation. Education is the nation's best insurance and its only assurance.

Viewed from one angle, this produces a morality that will tend to make a prosperous and a happy people, free from disorder and from many of the vices and ills that afflict and destroy. Certain it is, the goal should not be less than the one set forth. And, indeed, any courses that may be put into the curricula that will thus achieve so worthy an objective should be employed. There is one criticism, and that is that there appears to be the mark of selfishness in developing the human resources of the nation and in securing the largest physical and intellectual development, and at the same time failing to compass the chief objective of man, to glorify God.

Now, it makes little difference whether man is just a little better than the apes, and they progenitors of him, on the one hand, or whether he is a fallen angel and the ruins of his Maker on the other. In either case, he is far removed from God, and very short in either original righteousness or righteousness achieved and obtained. The fear is that he will need a higher source of help than can be provided in any course of study; and while these courses are not to be neglected, they are to be employed as supplementary to this noble ideal,

and to insure the citizenship that qualifies not only for time, but also for eternity.

It is gratifying to know that the president of one of the State universities has been willing to go so far as to include among the objectives of education "a sound morality and a secure and sublime religious faith." This remark was made by President W. D. Melton, of the University of South Carolina, in his annual report. To understand a little better his view of education, attention is directed to a quotation from this report:

> Every child has the right to a reasonable education, but he has no means of enforcing his right. Likewise, every youth has a right to such higher education as may be in keeping with his talents, and the measure of his attainments should not be made to depend upon arbitrary standards or the caprice of those appointed to instruct him. The purpose of education should not be so much to discover and train great scholars and scientists as to develop the average man and make of him a man of character and a good citizen imbued with ideals looking to the improvement of society and the betterment of his State.
>
> The very existence of the State depends upon its healthful development. If the State is to endure, it must have an intelligent and educated citizenship; it must have a just and equitable social order; it must have a sound morality and a secure and sublime religious faith. Such conditions can come only through education. It is accordingly the highest duty of the State to educate its citizens.[9]

Morality would inevitably be the fruitage of religion. It is true that a code of manners and behavior may approach in an outward manner the conduct that is the natural correspondence of religion. Under test or strain, however, it will collapse, and there can be no abiding influence to sustain morality apart from genuine religion.

[9] *University Weekly News*, University of South Carolina, March 4, 1925, Vol. 9, No. 22.

Moreover, the intellect itself will never reach its maximum in efficiency unless warmed by the zeal of a living faith. It has been truly said: "Real thinking involves one's heart as well as his mind; and by the heart is meant the emotions, will, affections, and life habits. All have their part in real thinking, and all are either strengthened or weakened by thought."[10]

The writer does not agree with Dr. Henry Neumann when he says that "religious beliefs themselves depend upon the quality of our ethical experiences." He has the cart before the horse. Religious experiences color and influence ethical beliefs. Surely the doctor does not mean to make religious beliefs and ethical experiences equivalent to each other. But that the reader may understand the point of difference, we quote Dr. Neumann more fully:

> It is the writer's conviction that an ethical training—not moral instruction alone or any other single device, but an intensive cultivation of the moral life at its best—will do these two things: 1. It will give the child all the moral sustenance that a "religious" education can give without binding him to beliefs he may feel called upon later to discard. 2. It will provide the best basis for whatever religious beliefs he may come later to profess. To make this clear it is necessary to dwell at length upon the fact that religious beliefs themselves depend upon the quality of our ethical experiences.[11]

Is Dr. Neumann reasoning in a circle? If religious beliefs depend upon ethical experiences, then by teaching ethics we produce ethical experiences, which in turn result in religious beliefs. What is religion? Presumably it is more than ethics, and is an experience foreign to a classroom and superior to any supplementary work that may be done there. True, by pressing the battle beyond the limitations that are supposed to exist in the

[10] "The Why and How Teacher," Vol. 2, p. 1.
[11] "Education for Moral Growth," pp. 333-334.

classroom, and by striking deeper than a veneer of morality, work may be done there that will result in religion, just as it can be done in the pulpit.

The writer begs leave to quote from an ancient wise man as follows: "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life."[12]

We are glad to quote Dr. Neumann when he rings a little more clear in the matter of "religious earnestness," especially when he says:

> The moral power encouraged by the old reverences is beyond question. People who got from their religion a compelling sense of exalted aims for the guidance of their lives were, to that extent, better than their easygoing, jaunty descendants who never put the fundamental questions at all. When one looks around and sees the cheap, superficial smartness of many a disbeliever, the frivolity, the tawdry emptiness of many a life that finds it easy to laugh at the faith of older days, one wishes that these persons could feel but the least touch of the religious earnestness that dignified the lives of their forbears.[13]

But no sooner do we begin to rejoice at the emphasis being placed upon the old ways and the moral power and religious earnestness that dignified the saints of the past, than we are brought straight up against a dangerous confession by the writer of the book on "Education for Moral Growth"—that is, if the statement that "many people to-day, by no means either frivolous or dishonest, find it impossible to believe as their ancestors did," represents his own experience. Inasmuch as a very vital matter affecting the whole thought of mankind to-day, in so far as ethics, morals, and religion are concerned, is here touched, we will quote the statement more at length:

[12] Proverbs iv. 23.
[13] "Education for Moral Growth," p. 332.

> But without entering upon the reasons for the decline of belief, we must accept the fact that many people to-day, by no means either frivolous or dishonest, find it impossible to believe as their ancestors did. Are they imperiling the moral salvation of their children by not teaching them the old faith? And how, they ask themselves, shall they respect the child's right to choose its own religion and at the same time protect it against the mischief attending exposure to the mercy of chance? The answers to these questions, we believe, will throw light on the problem of so-called godlessness not only in the home, but in the schools as well. [14]

Why are they renouncing the faith of their ancestors? Is that false which they believed to be true? Does truth change from age to age? Must some truths be reinterpreted in the light of what is termed modern science? Has not modern science itself changed several times within the last century? Which is true, that which is old or that which is new? Perhaps Dr. Neumann has opened up a flood of light upon the moral situation of our time. Certainly he is correct when he offers as an explanation that the parents are imperiling the salvation of their children by not teaching them the old faith; or at least he raises this question. If he means to intimate that they should defer to the child choosing his own religion, he is raising a serious question for pedagogues and preachers alike to consider. If they are to be allowed to choose their own religion, why not permit them to choose their own morals?

Just here it might be well to refer to "stereotypes" as used by Walter Lippman, in his book, "Public Opinion." There is one thing that a "stereotype" achieves, and that is to hold in the same groove of thinking, and under the law of association linking on kindred lines of thought. Moreover, these "stereotypes" come to have more or less of definite meaning for many

[14] "Education for Moral Growth," p. 332-333.

people. Often a public speaker, as Mr. Lippman has very well illustrated, will refer to certain terms or certain men in order to link himself on with these men or movements and get himself classified as he desires in the minds of his audience. In addition to this, he can steer clear of debatable grounds by talking about democracy, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and George Washington. Then, by reference to such terms as have been indicated, the minds of his hearers at once connote what they stand for. In a similar way, it is the privilege of parents, as well as teachers and schools, to give to youth certain stereotyped knowledge about the Word of God and religious things. In this way they are not likely to become dissatisfied and "find it impossible to believe as their ancestors did."

Certainly, this old faith will do them no harm. It will accomplish for them what it did for their ancestors. The State and society will be the beneficiaries. It is more true than the new knowledge. Some of those ancient "stereotypes" have lived through many centuries. Besides, some modern methods are causing the people to become dissatisfied with their faith; they are subject to very swift and rapid review. Much of this is either the direct result of extreme modernism, or it is a by-product. In proof of how this extreme liberalism gets its facts mixed, we herewith quote from the pen of a very prominent and aged minister who lives in Missouri:

> But concerning the Virgin birth liberals differ as to the fact, not its interpretation. No fact in the Gospel story is stated more clearly and definitely than the Virgin birth: first by Matthew, the business man, who records it briefly but clearly, and then by Luke, "the beloved physician," who must have had the story from Mary's own lips. No fact in ancient history has clearer and fuller internal evidence of its truthfulness and accuracy of detail

than the story of the Virgin birth as recorded by Luke in his Gospel.

The most questionable thing in this modern liberal movement is its desperate effort to discredit Luke as a historian in order to challenge the Virgin birth. Years ago they said Luke was an ignoramus because in the seventeenth chapter of Acts, in writing of the rulers of Thessalonica, he used the word "politarchs," which the critics said was not found in Greek literature. In 1898 I saw in the British Museum a marble slab dug up in the ruins of old Thessalonica which had on it a Greek inscription which speaks of the "politarchs" of that one city. To break the force of Luke's testimony they charge him with historical inaccuracies. Sir William Ramsay, author of "St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen," followed Paul's footsteps as no other man has ever done and stands the world's best authority on the travels of St. Paul. When some one named to him the thirteen errors which Professor Bacon, of Yale, claimed to have found in St. Luke and Acts, Sir William Ramsay's reply was that these errors were all in Bacon's brains and not one of them in Luke's writings. For me Luke is better authority than Professor Fosdick and all the other wise scholars of our day who are trying to give us a gospel which minimizes or eliminates the miraculous element by which Jesus Christ was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."[15]

In view of such flimsy scholarship as indicated herein, it is time to inquire if the "stereotypes" of the old faith, even though gray with age, may not be better than the imagined wisdom of these new scholars.

A Harvard professor is cited by Dr. Neumann for another purpose, but the citation is pertinent to the contention of the writer that religion is a better foundation for morality:

> What is asked of us teachers is, that we invite our pupils to direct study of the principles of conduct, that we awaken their consciousness about their

[15] *Christian Advocate*, Nashville, Tenn., February 27, 1925, Rev. C. H. Briggs, D.D., p. 264.

> modes of life, and so by degrees impart a science of righteousness. This is theory, ethics; not morals, practice; and in my judgment, it is dangerous business with the slenderest chance of success. . . . Many matters do not take their rise in knowledge at all. Morality does not.[16]

While granting the fact that morality has its highest source in religion, nevetheless it does not follow that steadfast efforts shall not be made in the schools and elsewhere to foster it. As a "stereotype," if nothing else, it may accomplish good, and will.

But these difficulties, from every angle, constantly cut in upon our line of thought, tending to limit our utmost hope. Let us see what may be achieved.

The National Education Association has worked out some cardinal principles of secondary education. The conclusion has been reached that the following seven objectives can be attained, and the Association recommends the reorganization of secondary education so as to apply to all pupils from twelve to eighteen years of age. These objectives are: Health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home-membership, vocation, civic education, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character.[17]

A book could be written unfolding these items. In fact, one has been written which in large measure has followed the suggestions here indicated. We refer to "Junior High School Life," by Thomas-Tindal and Myers.

Much might be said upon the subject of guidance in all of these worthy objectives. All of them are important. None is more so than the matter of ethical guidance. Neumann has well said:

> It is a problem of thoroughgoing ethical ideals for the whole of life, and it is here that we fall lamentably short. *The gravest problem for schools.*

[16] "Education for Moral Growth," p. 218.
[17] Bulletin, 1918, No. 35, pp. 11-18.

> *home, and community to-day is not raised by the relatively small number of criminals. It is raised by the moral unenlightenment of the much larger number of quite respectable persons.* These have no philosophy of life to point to higher levels of conduct for *all*—not one or two—of life's relationships. They have one set of standards for home affairs, another for business; one for duty toward the nation, another for obligation toward the home town; one for war days, another for peace. The marriage problem, the labor problem, the international situation, the questions thrust upon us in America and elsewhere by the contacts of the racially or otherwise unlike, these are thought of by only the few in the light of high, comprehensive ideals for the destiny of all human life. "Be assured," said Gladstone, "that life is a great and noble calling, not a mean or groveling thing through which we are to shuffle as we can, but a lofty and elevated destiny." Can we say that any such conviction supplies to most of our college graduates a focalizing direction for their home life, their business, their politics, their entire dealings?[18]

Thomas-Tindal and Myers are likewise clear in their position in reference to the guidance along ethical lines. They say:

> The ultimate aim of all education, which is also our seventh cardinal objective, should be the development of character, and, since character is the resultant of attempts to attain certain ideals of conduct, it behooves the true teacher to see to it that the ideals placed before her pupils are worthy ones.[19]

It is interesting to note that these writers not only emphasize the value of character as the end of education, but appreciate the ideals which assist in bringing about this objective. More important still is it and of consequence, that they feel that "instructional energy" may be employed. They say:

[18] "Education for Moral Growth," p. 3.
[19] "Junior High School Life," p. 118.

> We trust that it has made equally emphatic our belief that the ultimate object of all educational attainment is, or *should* be, character building, and that parents and teachers, the world over, should make common cause in the quest of this ideal. Possession of an ideal, however, will not suffice. The school, more than any other factor, must aid in its realization; must coordinate all purposeful activity to this end; must organize all instructional energy in such fashion that each agency, functioning at its best, may contribute to the work of developing junior citizens fitted to "worthily represent their day and country."[20]

They also suggest how this guidance may be extended along with the other work. For instance, a teacher of English may grasp the opportunity of emphasizing the ethics of journalism. Likewise, teachers of commercial subjects have the opportunity of stressing the ethics of certain occupations; they may point out the particular dangers to which these callings expose the individual. Moreover, in the field of history and biography, an opportunity is given to point out the moral of the man or the moral significance of an event. In this way school activities can also be made available, as in selecting the material for the debating society that will have a moral aspect. Clubs are indicated as furnishing opportunities, such as the public speaking and newspaper clubs, department of social welfare, story hour club, botany club, and "Willing Workers' Clubs." The botany club, for instance, would gather flowers for sick students and for the patients in the hospitals.[21]

Moreover, it is suggested that a work might be done along the line of Advocational Guidance, the object being to take care of the leisure hours of the students not only while they are young, but when they grow older. They quote Armand J. Gerson as saying:

[20] "Junior High School Life," p. 123.
[21] *Idem*, pp. 120-124.

> If I had my life to live over again, I should definitely cultivate some talent or hobby as a preparation for the pleasant and wholesome occupation of leisure. I do not know whether it would be music, pictures, or some form of sport, but it would serve the important purpose of furnishing needed relief and change from the occupations that fill one's working hours. However interesting one's daily work may be, it requires the relief of sensible relaxation. A man should be trained to play as hard as he works, and training to this end should be begun in youth.[23]

In the matter of vocational guidance also, an ethical approach may be given. The student can be led to consider the field of service in which he might contribute most good. In doing this the teacher will have to avoid certain mistakes that the vocational experts make. The author became a subject in a clinic held by one of these experts in order to find out the method employed. The expert had a chart covered with many questions, very much like the application for a life insurance policy. He ascertained whether or not the subject's father owned his business,—that is, whether he had managerial ability or not—inquired about his education, character of his work, etc. Similar questions were directed to get the facts in the case of the grandparents and uncles on each side, as well as the mother and the aunts. With these facts of heredity laid out on a chart, an expert was superfluous to announce what he should do. However, life has an objective beyond success—to glorify God. Duty may require that one should lay aside aptitude and ambition, in order that he may enter a life of service.

It is conceded by all that character is the ultimate objective of all education. We are told that Tyndall, the materialistic physicist, said: "There is a thing of more value than science: it is nobility of character."

[23] "Junior High School Life," p. 110.

Huxley is reputed to have said: "Clever men are as common as blackberries; the rare thing is to find a good one."[23] Christianity is alone able to produce the ideal character.

The training of the moral and religious nature will prove a benefit not only to the intellectual and the distinctly spiritual, but also to the physical as well. A nerve specialist has said:

> In our final analysis nervous illness presents a problem which is fundamentally moral. Rarely will one suffering nervously be found in whom some damaging moral defect is not present, ever adding its venom to physical and mental toxins. The whole question of human attitude resides in the moral self. Unworthy attitudes can decimate ease, poise, comfort, and satisfaction in the physically strong and in those otherwise mentally well-balanced; just as the wholesome attitudes heal the wounds of conflict, and brighten and lighten the dark days of failure, and bring the ray of hope or the support of faith into all those relations which would otherwise be empty of good.[24]

This same writer has also said:

> The best and the worst of man will ever be expressed through his moral nature.[25]

Now, just a word as to the teacher and the subject matter of the courses in the curricula for moral education. We are told:

> The educator's part in the enterprise of education is to furnish the environment which stimulates responses and directs the learner's course. In the last analysis, *all* that the educator can do is modify stimuli so that response will as surely as is possible result in the formation of desirable intellectual and

[23] "The Mastery of Nervousness," by Robert S. Carroll, M. D., Medical Director of Highland Hospital, Asheville, N. C., page 238.

[24] *Idem*, p. 241.

[25] *Idem*, p. 241.

> emotional dispositions. Obviously studies or the subject matter of the curriculum have intimately to do with this business of supplying an environment.[36]

As the teacher can modify the stimuli which arouse the student, as the content of the curriculum does help to create and make an environment, and as environment is of value apart from the content of the course itself, the argument for having courses of study which include a content having distinct moral value grows stronger.

It is admitted that the ardor of the teacher is often dampened by reason of his knowledge of the tremendous power of heredity. However, he is expected to be familiar with the influence that personality has both in the presence of heredity and in environment. He should remember that the student, while liable to succumb to heredity, nevertheless has the power to modify many of these factors. The concurrent opinion of many minds strengthens this hope. Were it not so, there could be little validity in the testimony of teachers who employ the *formal method.* These teachers do believe that a curriculum embracing moral subjects achieves results. Besides, the testimony of the teachers who believe in the doctrine of suggestion likewise is to the effect that the content of courses of study has value. The conclusion is that maxims, mottoes, pictures, and precepts, as well as memorized selections from the Bible and other religious literature, will leave a deposit in character. The public demands that an honest effort along these lines shall be made. The needs of society to-day indicate that such a demand is justified.

Here is a quotation from *Collier's Weekly* (an editorial), which is indicative of the trend of present-day thought on this subject:

> Beyond the bounds of space and time moves the Power that multitudes call God. On every level of

[36] Dewey, "Democracy and Education," p. 212.

intelligence or of degradation men have felt themselves purest of heart, clearest of thought, and surest of hand when their souls were somehow at peace with that Eternal Righteousness.

Knowing that, dare we withhold such knowledge from our children? Is it not our plain duty to tell them those things of God wherein we are all agreed?

Varying faiths reached by different paths of reason and of experience must not mean no faith for those who are to follow us. That were treason to the coming generations.

Our schools teach the facts of nature as and because the scientists have ascertained and agreed on them. That does not end the duty of the schools. To-day more than ever our paramount duty is to strengthen the spiritual life of humanity.

How can that be done? By earnestly striving to express our present human unity of faith in God and by teaching school children everywhere not our differences of creed but our oneness of belief in the Power greater than ourselves that makes for righteousness.[27]

[27] *Collier's Weekly*, December 20, 1924, p. 24.

CHAPTER IX

THE SUPERNATURAL IN EDUCATION

HAVING called attention to the contribution of the Church to the field of education, and having given considerable attention to the moral drift of education today, and also having stated the important place of the teacher, the subject would be incomplete without giving some attention to the distinct deposit of religion itself. So, without intending to be dogmatic in discussing this topic, we propose to open the subject for further discussion as a field that needs wider exploitation. This suggestion is made with caution, because it may be that there are certain schools of pedagogy which would regard with unfriendliness any approach to the realm of the supernatural. Strange to say, many of these thinkers might be willing to discuss with calmness the relation of the Church to education, and also the distinct relation of religion to education. Yet, some of these same persons might assume an attitude of hostility at the very mention of the word, "supernatural."

We have mentioned the word "supernatural" with deliberation and with "malice aforethought." For this writer certainly does not regard religion as having any value that does not emanate from the supernatural, and does not receive its power because of its relation to the unseen and invisible world. Moreover, this writer takes the position that religion has value and value only because of the fact that it is rooted in the forces and in the powers that are mightier than anything that the eye hath seen or the ear heard. Religion is the greatest

factor within the experience of humanity. Those who have partaken of it will not bring this assertion into question. Those who have not been initiated into the mystery of it are not valid witnesses, because they are undertaking to make affirmations about that of which they know nothing. Because a man himself may be ignorant of the fact, is in no sense conclusive proof that the fact does not exist. For instance, a person may affirm that he heard another make a certain statement. He may make this affirmation upon a distinct recollection of what he knows he certainly heard. However, if asked as to whether he had heard this individual make another statement, and if he should reply that he had no recollection of having heard the statement made, this would only mean that he was ignorant of any such statement being made, or that his memory had failed to record the fact. It would not mean that he was not correct with reference to what he did remember. Neither would it mean that the individual had not made a statement which the hearer had failed to record. Only witnesses of the supernatural who have explored its mysteries and understand from personal experience its reality are competent.

There is spiritual vitality in the invisible, or else there are millions of people that have been deceived. Certainly many give testimony to an experience that lies outside of cold logic, which is explainable only upon the hypothesis of a mysterious and supernatural life, which in turn is the result of contact with the invisible world. Conversion, itself, is a miracle.

Jesus regarded it as such. In the doctrine of the new birth, set forth in the third chapter of John, in the historic interview with Nicodemus, the ruler of the Jews, Jesus clearly and unmistakably taught the doctrine of the miraculous nature of conversion. Moreover, this has been the universal experience of men from the

days of the apostles down to the present hour. It has characterized and marked every great moral and religious awakening from that time until this. Martyrs did not go to their death under the dry-as-dust postulates of a mere worldly culture. They went to their deaths under the inspiration which filled their souls with a living fire. Their position had become so potent with power that death itself was to be despised in comparison with renouncing those convictions which they held. Moreover, in the definition of conversion, Jesus, instead of trying to explain, merely explained that it was a mystery: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."[1]

Moreover, the manifestation of the Spirit after Pentecost is as much a historic fact as is the collapse of the Roman Empire. Nothwithstanding the findings of modern criticism, there still remain some points of history not in question. In addition to this, there have been other marks of the supernatural presence of God in movements since then. The Reformation under Martin Luther was not devoid of marks of power from an unseen world. The revival under the Wesleys in England, and afterwards in America, clearly reveals what the power of God can do.

Notwithstanding the profound culture of the founder of this movement, there was something wanting in his life which prevented him from being able to make available his intellectual assets in a concrete, definite, and successful way. As a consequence he was greatly perturbed himself. Nevertheless, while in Georgia Wesley had met the Moravians. On his return to London he came to know Peter Bohler, of whom he says: "Bohler amazed me more and more by the account he gave of

[1] John iii. 8.

fruits of faith, the love, holiness, and happiness he affirmed to attend it.''[2] Shortly thereafter, on May 24, 1738, he attended Fetter Lane in the morning, St. Paul's in the afternoon, and Aldersgate Street at night. Regarding the evening service Wesley says: ''About a quarter before nine . . . I felt my heart strangely warmed.''[3] At last he had realized the parting message of his dying father, which was: ''The inward witness, son, . . . the inward witness, that is the proof, the strongest proof, of Christianity,''[4] In this relationship to the supernatural, all competent authorities now agree that Methodism was born. Was this hallucination? Is it true that upon a foolish fancy the largest Protestant body in America has been established?

This same kind of experience characterized the associates of John Wesley. Three days before John's experience, his brother Charles had entered into a like experience. Whitefield had experienced this singular evangelical joy two or three years before. It was in February, 1739, that ''the noted irregularity began.'' The agent in this manifestation of the power of the unseen world was Whitefield. With the doors of Bristol closed against him, and even with the prison shut against his eloquent appeal, he turned to the benighted colliers of Kingswood. Two hundred listened to his first message, two thousand to the second, and still others at subsequent services. Wesley came to his relief, ''Men and women fell down in swoons or convulsive agitations.''[5]

''The Great Awakening'' in America was likewise of supernatural origin. It may be said to have had its in-

[2] Fitchett, ''The Life of Wesley,'' pp. 116-117.
[3] Hastings, ''Encyclopedia of Ethics and Religion,'' Vol. 12, pp. 724-725.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] Sheldon,''History of the Christian Church,'' Part 2,pp.46-49.

ception under the ministry of Jonathan Edwards in 1734. Then there was a period of inaction, and in 1739 the smoldering flames sprang forth with great power.[6] Even the historian, Channing, writing on "The Great Awakening," says: "For it must be remembered that religious liberalism has ever gone hand in hand with religious indifference."[7] So, the historian would not only record a great religious movement, but make a suggestion also which may be pertinent for the liberals of to-day to think about. It was in 1739 that Jonathan Edwards preached his sermon on "Eternity of Hell Torments." A witness present on that occasion wrote in his diary concerning the moaning and crying of the people and tells how one cried, "What shall I do to be saved?—Oh, I am going to Hell—Oh, what shall I do for Christ?" "Moreover, we are told that the shrieks and cries of the people were such that Edwards had to desist for a time. Men and women were unable to support themselves; some grasped the pillars of the church to keep from falling; others groveled on the floor, or lay inert on the benches."[8]

If we are to maintain that religion has any relation to education at all, it is necessary to understand the supernaturalness of religion. Moreover, in this age of comparatively Christless culture, it is doubly necessary to know with what we are dealing when we come into contact with religion. Of course, it is generally understood that there is a formality connected with the Churches which means neither Christ nor religion, but a perfunctory adherence to external forms in the name of religion. Nobody understands this better than men who have been called of God to preach, and whose hearts

[6] Green, "Provincial America, (Am. Nation Series), Vol. 6, p. 321.
[7] Channing's "History of the United States," Vol. 2, p. 43.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

have been brought to the door of despair because of the nominal profession of their Church members devoid of the spirit and vitality of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Without offsetting or seeking to impair the fine work which pedagogues have done in throwing light upon the problem of teaching and the work of instruction, it is not out of place to remark upon the attitude of the subject or the receptivity of the pupil. For the present, then, leaving to one side the question of the superiority of the Christian teacher over one who is a stranger to religion in the real sense of the term, it is well to consider a changed attitude on the part of the pupil by reason of his supernatural experience. If religion was able to take a fisherman disciple and make him the eloquent preacher of the cross on the day of Pentecost; if religion could take the poor student, George Whitefield, and clothe him with international renown by reason of the intense enthusiasm engendered on account of the presence of the Spirit; and if religion could take the scholar, Jonathan Edwards, and make him the agent of God for promoting a great revival in America, we cannot disregard religion as a factor connected with the intellectual life of men. Moreover, a book by Begbee, "Twice-Born Men," is an illustration of what religion can do in making over men. A widely known preacher, who was at one time one of the General Secretaries in a great denomination, was heard to say: "Conversion is worth more to a man intellectually than a year spent in college." If these were not the exact words of his utterance, they convey the thought which was in his mind. Probably no one who is familiar at all with psychology will bring this statement into question.

The Psalmist said: "Unite my heart to fear thy

name.'"[9] Why did he say it? He evidently knew that with a divided heart he would hardly be able to render a true or a loyal service. With a united heart he knew that he would be able to concentrate his affections, his energies, and his attentions on the things of God. If education is to progress, those who go forward in it must of necessity get their thoughts centered on what they are about. Anything, then, that unifies the soul, mobilizes and correlates the energies of mind, renders an immense contribution to the cause of the education of that individual. This is exactly what religion does.

In a bisected heart there will be division of interest and weakness of effort. In unity there is strength. This applies to the individual as well as to groups. It is necessary to get the myriad minds in one man combined if that individual is to deliver his entire strength at one time and to one effect.

Moreover, there are moral reasons involved in religion which cause this agency to minister to the development of the mind. The mind may fail of development because of lack of opportunity, or because its attention has been unconsciously drawn off through channels of interest that are largely immoral and worldly in their nature. These immoral interests are always *demoralizing*. The absence of definite and concrete morality, which is best secured by being placed upon a strong religious experience, often leaves the mind to grow up in weeds and its attention to be so scattered with trivial objects as to weaken it as though it had been done by intention and a set purpose. Whatever places the entire entity of the individual upon a distinctly moral basis supplies that person with a kind of gyroscope with which to hold him to the right course through life.

Then, too, religion sets the soul on fire. It takes im-

[9] Psalm lxxxvi. 11.

pulse, motive, passion to get the individual into high gear. This is exactly what religion does. Therefore, we cannot leave untouched a phase of life which has played such a vital and prominent part not only in the history of races, but in the nations of the earth. The receptivity of the student is at once quickened by his renewed interest in life and by the objectives which lie before him. Few individuals can find much inspiration in the study of the abstract sciences. Usually it is necessary to look beyond the employment of the day to the goal and the aim of the future. As religion causes the pupil to look toward a life of usefulness, and to a life of service to mankind, and also to the Church of the living God, it supplies that worthy objective which makes him willing to forego the displeasure of the present task in view of the future victory.

Religion is generally regarded, or at least the crisis of conversion is recognized, as the climateric experience of the soul. We at least are justified in placing it among the altitudes of the experiences which excite, inspire, and ennoble humanity. In all the ages religion has been one of the predominating factors in the historic experiences of people. How, then, can education fail to give due consideration to the part that the supernatural must play in our educational programs? This part, then, is the unification of the soul, the mobilization of interest, the intensifying of desires, the elevation of objective, and persistence in the effort to realize the aim.

So, without jeopardizing in any sense what has been said in previous chapters, and without entering into debate in any dogmatic way with the educators, we respectfully submit that herein is the field at least worthy of deep consideration on the part of all thinking men and especially so on the part of those who have to deal with the great problem of education. It is quite perti-

nent to every person who has to touch adolescent life. Moreover, in some of the departments of our school life of to-day thought is being given to the matter of moral education, and also to that of vocational guidance. Can moral education stand alone unsupported by religion? How can vocational guidance be completely done unless it takes in that large circle that covers all the smaller circles—religion?

Finally, do we believe to-day in the doctrine of an immortality beyond the grave? Does life end its short and fretful story in the silence of the death chamber? Or, is there a period beyond the night of death when the soul may still remember? Is there a judgment, a judgment more than the automatic consequences of present misdeeds? Let us answer these questions while considering the problem of education. If there is no hereafter, then an education that meets the needs of the present; if worldly interests sufficiently high can challenge attention and unify effort, then perhaps this will do as a makeshift, though not as the best. But if beyond the stars our real existence begins, we can hardly fail to give religion its proper place in the scheme of present-day education.

Furthermore, if our religion is not supernatural, it is worthless. A culture without Christ is dead. Those writers who would explain the miracles of Jesus by robbing them of the miraculous are explaining nothing; for if there is anything in the supernatural, then the miraculous becomes at once natural. Certainly, the ability of the Deity can hardly be denied. Granting his ability, there can be no limitation upon His power. With his power given, surely he may do as he would. For the creedless, Christless culture, let us have the living heart-throb of a divine God, with an ever-living Son! Then education will have a sufficient motive, and civilization a base to rest upon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, John: "Herbartian Psychology Applied to Education."
Bobbitt, Franklin: "How to Make a Curriculum."
Briggs, Charles Augustus: "History of the Study of Theology."
Carroll, Robert Sproul: "The Mastery of Nervousness."
Christian Advocate.
Christian Education.
Collier's Weekly.
Columbia (S. C.) State.
Cubberly, Ellwood P.: "Readings in the History of Education," "Public Education in the United States."
Darwin, Charles: "The Origin of Species."
Dearborn Independent.
Dewey, John: "Democracy and Education."
Good Housekeeping.
Graves, Frank Pierrepont: "A History of Education (Before the Middle Ages)."
Griggs, Edward Howard: "Moral Education."
Holy Bible, The
Homiletic Review, The
Jordan, David Starr: "The Factors in Organic Evolution (A Syllabus)."
Kemp, E. L.: "History of Education."
Literary Digest, The
Philobiblius: "History of Education."
Robbins, Charles L.: "The School as a Social Institution."
Severn, Elizabeth: "The Psychology of Behavior."
Spencer, Herbert: "Education."
Thomson, W. H.: "Brain and Personality."
Wallace, Alfred Russell: "Darwinism."
West, Mason: "Ancient World."
White and Jelliffe: "Modern Treatment of Nervous and Mental Diseases."

Date Due

9-21			

Library Bureau Cat. no. H37

LC 511 5C342